

The study was jointly sponsored by the Protestant-supported Community Service Center, the Roman Catholic Mother Butler Center and the mayor's committee.

Particular interest in the religious affiliations of the Indians in the community has made the study significant to a number of churches in the community.

Results show that those admitted to church membership, 227 families named the Roman Catholic Church, 114 the Episcopal Church, 15 the Congregational Church, 11 the Presbyterian Church, 9 the Methodist Church, but none claimed membership in the Indian Native American Church.

There were 43 families that spoke of mixed marriages and 10 adhered to various Pentecostal groups.

The census was part of a study begun by Father White in 1957 when he interviewed 150 Indian families in Rapid City.

Since then he has spent considerable time here in conjunction with his work in sociology at St. Louis University in Missouri.

Support for the census and for a related study among the non-Indian families in the city has come from the National Institutes of Mental Health, Bethesda, Md., and help in the actual canvassing was given by individuals from various organizations, including the American Association of University Women, the two church centers and the mayor's committee.

The complete report on the entire study will be presented in a book Father White is compiling. Publication is due in 1965.

Watchdogs Over CIA Demanded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have continually called for the establishment of a joint congressional committee to oversee the CIA and our other intelligence agencies. Since the beginning of this year when I introduced legislation in the form of House Joint Resolution 211, which would accomplish this objective, I have called on Congress to act on this matter. The people of America are concerned over the unbridled activities of the CIA, and the news media has joined in this concern by pointing out time after time the hazards of an unscrutinized intelligence community.

I fear that the CIA sometimes seems to embody the fiction of an Ian Fleming novel—however, intelligence information is fact, not fiction, and should be dealt with accordingly.

It is clear in my mind and apparently in the minds of several of our colleagues who have joined me in introducing legislation to provide for a "watchdog committee" over the CIA, that there is a need for a joint congressional committee whose sole function is to oversee the activities of the CIA and our other intelligence agencies.

At this point in the record, I would like to insert a recent article from the Los Angeles Times entitled "Watchdogs Over CIA Demanded," written by John H. Averill:

WATCHDOGS OVER CIA DEMANDED—LAWMAKERS ASSERT THEY HAVE RIGHT TO CHECK ON AGENCY

(By John H. Averill)

WASHINGTON.—Speculation on the role of the Central Intelligence Agency in South Vietnam's coup d'etat has revived congressional demands for a special watchdog committee to keep an eye on the spy agency's activities.

There have been similar demands in the past, particularly after one of the CIA's U-2 spy planes went down over Russia in 1960. The demands got nowhere.

However, advocates of a congressional watchdog committee say that more and more Members of Congress are becoming concerned and demanding that something be done. The CIA was established by Congress in 1947 under the Defense Unification Act and given broad authority in the intelligence field overseas.

POINTS TO RIGHT

"I think that Congress has a right to know if the Nation is getting its money's worth from the CIA," said Representative PAUL G. ROGERS, Democrat, of Florida, one of the more persistent backers of efforts to create a joint Senate-House committee on intelligence activities.

As things now stand, only a select handful of Senate and House Members even know how much money the CIA gets. Estimates range from a half billion to a billion dollars a year.

It is this handful which most strongly opposes creation of a watchdog committee. And since the group includes some of the most influential Members of Congress, such as Representative CARL VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, the powerful and crusty chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, it has been able so far to stave off the watchdog committee proposals.

NO NEED SEEN

VINSON, chairman of a special nine-man Armed Services Subcommittee on Intelligence, declared he sees "absolutely no need for a joint committee."

"We know what the CIA is doing," VINSON said in an interview. "We know what goes on and we are satisfied with the operations of the CIA."

He noted that the House Appropriations Committee also has a special subcommittee headed by Representative GEORGE H. MAHON, Democrat, of Texas, to pass on CIA appropriations and that the Senate has a similar six-man group made up of members of its Armed Services and Appropriations Committees.

"I've been around here for 49 years," VINSON said, "and I'm satisfied the CIA is getting sufficient congressional supervision."

This view is challenged, however, by some other Members of Congress in both Houses.

SAYS HE'S IN DARK

"We are working in the dark," said Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, Republican, of New York, "or at least in the semitwilight."

LINDSAY and ROGERS are among 15 House Members of both parties who are sponsoring resolutions to create either a joint committee with the Senate or a special House committee to keep a constant eye on CIA activities.

"I think we are gathering more support all the time," said ROGERS, "particularly after the debacle in Cuba, rumors of CIA foulups in Latin America and reports that the CIA was involved in the Vietnam affair."

ROGERS, while emphasizing he was not quarrelling with the Armed Services or Appropriations Committees argued that an adequate job of checking CIA activities cannot be done by anything less than a full-time committee which has no other function.

"There must be a continuing watchdog,"

he said, "not only of the CIA but of the Defense Department intelligence community, too, and there must be a constant review of how intelligence information is coordinated and evaluated."

"Any agency of Government that is not carefully watched can develop practices that would not be tolerated if they were open to careful and responsible congressional review."

"I'm not saying the CIA has developed these practices. We just don't know. If it hasn't it would have nothing to fear from congressional review. But there is mistrust and concern in Congress about the CIA and if we had a joint committee we could allay these suspicions and restore confidence."

ROGERS' views were seconded generally by Representative H. ALLEN SMITH, Republican, of California, a former FBI agent who worked on several World War II espionage cases.

SAYS FBI REPORT

"The CIA is no more secret than the FBI," SMITH said, "and the FBI gives Congress all the information it requests, puts out annual reports on its activities, and lets Congress know how much money it needs and spends."

SMITH said it was because of all the secrecy that he opposed a bill passed by the House last week to authorize more liberal retirement benefits for CIA agents involved in hazardous assignments.

In opposing the bill, SMITH said it was his guess that Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev "and even the Russian Embassy here in Washington know more about CIA than I do."

SMITH in an interview said he was not advocating release of any secret information that might harm national security or jeopardize a CIA agent's life.

"I just think we have a responsibility, since we vote the money, to know how many employees the CIA has, what they do, what the policies are, if any, and whether the job is being done as it should be," SMITH said.

POINTS TO DANGERS

This view was challenged by Representative GERALD R. FORD, Jr., Republican of Michigan, a member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Intelligence.

"I see no need for any special committee," FORD said, "I know of no instance where we have requested information that it has been denied."

"The CIA is a lot more complicated than the FBI. It is involved in operations throughout the world and there could be real dangers to expose the CIA to total scrutiny."

FORD agreed that perhaps his and VINSON's subcommittees could do more to allay congressional suspicions about the CIA by apprising their colleagues of some of the information the subcommittees obtain.

"The trouble," he said, "is to determine what can be released. Everything about the CIA is so sensitive to national security you just can't give it to everyone but if you give it to one you've got to give it to all and then you have a big, first-class leak."

We Must Stand Together in This Hour of Sorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate Caleb King, Jr., editor of the Florida Times Union,

on the excellent editorial published in the November 25 edition of that paper. It was truthfully there said that "A man of courage and ability has fallen in the service of his country." Having served with Mr. King in World War II, I know that when he paid this tribute to our fallen leader, President Kennedy, he is conscious, as am I, that the President died as a soldier for his country, as truly as any recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor. Soldierlike, Mr. King observes that "life must go on" and we must all "stand strongly behind" our new leader. The late President Kennedy would have been the first to say that. The editorial reads as follows:

WE MUST STAND TOGETHER IN THIS HOUR OF SORROW

A grim and sorrowing Nation will honor the late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, in solemn rites in Washington at noon today. The grief, which every American shares with the widow and family of the late Chief Executive, is in no way assuaged by the knowledge that justice is moving swiftly to exact retribution for the dastardly crime.

All Americans may, however, take justifiable pride in the way in which our Nation has drawn together in this hour of mourning and in the spirit of bipartisan cooperation which the Congress has pledged to President Lyndon Johnson upon his succession to the office lately held by a young and vigorous leader.

Many Americans are inclined to view the theory of bipartisan support with skepticism. The theory was devised by President Franklin D. Roosevelt to meet the emergencies and needs of World War II, but it has not always been successfully applied since his time.

But, bipartisanship is an honorable policy for all to follow in times of national crisis and tragedy, such as this Nation is now experiencing. In such times there can be no thought but that which is the best for the Nation as a whole.

In these modern times it is hard to decide where domestic and foreign policies end or begin. It used to be said that domestic policies ended at the water's edge, but now those things which affect us internally often affect us externally as a nation. The President's murderer has, therefore, changed all our history in the single, treacherous pull of a trigger.

No one can say with certainty what the changes will be nor how they will affect all of us or all free men in the world.

The new President has in brief and solemn words sought the bipartisan support of Congress, the help of the people, and the aid of Almighty God. The trials which now face him are many and great and upon their successful resolution much depends.

In the final analysis life must go on. A man of courage and ability has fallen in the service of his country. None can explain or understand why he should have been called upon to make this supreme sacrifice, to all it appears a useless and senseless waste of a life dedicated to service.

We may all give meaning to the life of the late President, so tragically shortened, by pledging ourselves anew to stand strongly behind President Lyndon Johnson and to offer prayers for the comfort of the living and a safe voyage through these perilous times for our Nation.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the entire world mourns the passing of our late President, as does our own Nation. We in Florida and the Sixth District feel the loss acutely, as we considered the President and his family as neighbors and friends. The winter White House at Palm Beach was a familiar place to all, and Palm Beach itself had witnessed not only the comings and goings of the President but his growth and development from childhood until the weekend prior to his tragic death.

Millions of words have already been written about the man and the act which has taken him from us at the prime of his life, when we know in our hearts words cannot express our feelings. To his family we can only say the prayer, God be with you, which has already manifested itself in the courage and strength which we have all witnessed and which will be an inspiration for years to come.

To the memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy the American people should rededicate themselves to abolish from this land forever the hate and discord which created the atmosphere for this tragedy, and remember the warning of Lincoln that while no foreign power may ever conquer, we have within ourselves the power to destroy our own Nation. Every single citizen must take an active part in the work of returning our Nation to the rule of reason and of law.

Mr. Speaker, I include several representative editorials from Florida at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Palm Beach Post, Nov. 23, 1963]

SHOCK AND MOURNING

America today is in mourning.

A great, good man is dead at the hands of an assassin. The youngest man ever elected to the Presidency of the United States, a brilliant statesman with a valorous war record, a beloved family man with an abiding faith in God—has been cut down in the prime of his career.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy has joined the martyrs. Like his illustrious predecessors, he now belongs to the ages.

In the Palm Beaches, which was to the President a "second home" and site of the "winter White House," shock prevails. Only a few days ago, he was among us, vigorous and smiling.

We join the universal hope that his assassin will be apprehended and properly punished. But this is a secondary consideration. Such a foul deed could have been conceived and executed only by diseased minds.

Our thoughts at this time are primarily of sympathy for the bereaved family, and of hope and concern for our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson.

May God be with them all, and with us.

[From the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News, Nov. 24, 1963]

WORDS UNSPOKEN AT DALLAS OFFER GUIDANCE TO NATION IN THE TRYING DAYS AHEAD

President John F. Kennedy was to have made a speech in Dallas on Friday. Before he reached the appointed place, the 35th President of the United States held a rendezvous with death and his voice was stilled forever, his words unspoken.

Although they were left unsaid, the words should be our guide in this awkward hour when a President of the United States rests this very day in state in the rotunda of the Capitol, and while the new President works in the heavy presence of death and mourning, to take over our Nation's affairs and chart the direction the ship of state shall sail for the next 14 months.

Well might President Lyndon B. Johnson heed those words unspoken. Well might every American citizen weigh them and accept them as counsel through the convulsions that must occur during the difficult transition.

What Mr. Kennedy had intended to say in his Dallas speech was an excerpt from the Bible, Psalm 124: "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it. Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain."

Mr. Kennedy was a master of oratory and there were those among us who believed that he often spoke wise counsel, but too often did not pay heed as he spoke. All of that is of consequence no longer, for in the martyrdom of his high office, the President rests expiated of human frailties, left to the judgment of his Maker and of history.

What is of consequence is that Mr. Kennedy had chosen to recite from a psalm which, through lamentable and shocking circumstances, should now become an echoing reminder for Americans through the remaining ages.

They are the words in which can be found the answer to the anguished question of House Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, who, when informed of Mr. Kennedy's assassination, cried out: "My God, My God. What are we coming to?"

Both the question and the reply found in the psalm should serve as admonitions to each and every American citizen. Indeed, what were we coming to in the mounting tempest, calmed for now by the chill of death?

Irrefutably, we had become a divided nation; ultra-liberal against ultra-conservative, Democrat against Republican, northerner against southerner, atheist against religionist, black against white, American against American.

We had been caught up in an ugly web of opportunism, of materialism; placed at the mercy of outside influences that would bury us, sapped of resolve to pay any cost for the preservation of our inherited doctrine, caught in a crosscurrent of demands upon another without regard for one to the other.

We were a finely divided nation and we knew it; yet little of anything was accomplished in restoring our national unity. We were on a collision course with the future that awaited us in November 1963.

Our direction from that point on shall remain forever unknown, obliterated by a searing bullet triggered by one individual whose horrendous action may leave us uncertain and exposed to deepening schism, or spared the rendering that awaited at the point of collision.

That we never will know.

But this we do know: If this Nation is to be destroyed and, as Mr. Kennedy once said,

Is it because trade with anybody friend or foe, is only a commercial venture and when we boil out the propaganda and double talk it is the profit involved that stirs the emotions.

Our Canadian friends are not a bit backward about their position and appear a bit miffed by ours.

I pray we do not gain a sale and lose a friend.

Former President Harry Truman is reported to have once remarked that we should give wheat to needy China. Regardless of their position in other matters, people are people, and hunger is a universal appeal for help.

The only real danger in a commercial act of charity is the false pretense and the danger of being lulled into a condition of carelessness and lowering our guard by piling deal upon deal with a nation as yet not proven to be sincere in their efforts for peaceful coexistence.

Lenin is supposed to have said that "The capitalist world would be willing to sell to the Communists for profit, the rope with which the Communists will hang the capitalists."

I would hope we are not in this category of capitalist nations but rather a nation motivated by the concept of live and let live in all our endeavors.

It is hard to condemn a deal whether it is with Russia or anyone else when you sincerely want to believe it is done for reasons best for our Nation and our people. This we must believe.

The Canadians may be right but I doubt the prosperity of their critical news which our peoples who as yet have not fully understood the transaction. The Canadian report follows:

THE LATEST CRISIS IS THE WHEAT EXPORT FIGHT—AND THE UNITED STATES IS ACTUALLY ARGUING IN DOUBLETALK

(By J. K. Edmonds)

WINNIPEG.—When the Americans complain about the price at which Canada made its latest sale of wheat to Japan, what's really bothering them is not our pricing system, but their own.

The United States is on the special hotspot reserved for countries which have a two-price system for a commodity traded on the world market and have accumulated a large volume of surplus in store.

U.S. domestic price for its wheat is more than 50 cents above the world's. The U.S. Government supports the price by buying surplus stocks which it sells for blocked currencies, gives away, or sells on long-term credit.

Commercial sales of U.S. wheat carry a subsidy which represents the difference between the support price and the world price. When the wheat is given away to an underdeveloped country, the U.S. taxpayer feels a warm glow of generosity. When it is sold to Russia, he wonders why he should subsidize the Russian consumer. The more the volume of sales, the higher the total subsidy.

This, more than cold war politics, is what held up the Russian-United States wheat deal. Washington has been ready since the beginning of wheat sale talks to sell to Russia at the domestic price—but Russia wouldn't pay it.

Washington would have been off this spot if the world price had risen to equal the U.S. domestic price. The price was moving upward rapidly. The Canadian Wheat Board has been announcing advances in its offering price at frequent intervals since the Russian

sale, even though in practice it was not selling any wheat, pending assessment of stocks, shipping probabilities, and requirements of regular customers.

With the Wheat Board out of the picture, there was some unofficial (but legal) trading in wheat at prices 10 to 12 cents above the Board's price. The prices applied to small quantities held in private hands (as a result of previous purchases from the Board) and sold to purchasers who had gambled on availability of wheat to load vessels already in transit when the wheat sales were cut off.

Washington may have expected the Wheat Board price to move up to meet the unofficial price. They charge that the Board refused to allow the forces of supply and demand to push up the price of wheat.

Whether there's anything in the charge depends on the assessment of the forces of supply and demand. What's really holding down the price of wheat is the surplus stocks in U.S. hands. If they didn't exist, or if they could be held off the market, the price would be rising faster than it is.

But the U.S. surplus stocks hang over the market for wheat at present levels of demand and prices, just as much as they did when the price of wheat was lower and dropping in August.

If the Americans had decided they'd rather give away the wheat than sell it to Russia at the world price, chances are it would still have reached Russia.

The underdeveloped countries to whom it is shipped might resell it to Communist countries in exchange for badly needed gold or foreign exchange reserves. If Washington had decided to keep the wheat in storage rather than sell to Russia at the world price, the taxpayer still would have had to pay the cost of storage, and also cope with the surplus problem next year, when the Russian demand may be much lower.

Canada has had none of these problems in dealing with Russia because we have only one price for wheat: the price announced daily by the Canadian Wheat Board. There is no Government subsidy.

This price is intended to meet or beat the price at which customers can buy equivalent grain elsewhere. This is the only price at which Canadian wheat is traded. When Russia made its big purchase, Russian traders wanted a quantity discount—but didn't get it. They bought at the market price on the day of the sale. So did Japan.

Canada does tend to lean against the market to try to iron out short-run movements of wheat prices, because the board is interested in maximizing revenues over the whole crop year, not in profit on any single sale.

The Canadian price is ordinarily slower to move than the price at Chicago or Liverpool. The board occasionally has been charged with missing chances to move wheat faster by failing to cut prices quickly enough. During the rest of this crop year, the board probably will move slowly in raising the price, because it can't afford to give long-time customers the impression it is eager to gouge them. In this sense, there may be something in Washington's complaints.

Ottawa knows how it feels to be on the spot now occupied by Washington. A few years ago, Canada was selling butter to Czechoslovakia at a price below the domestic support price in Canada. Consumer organizations and newspapers in Canada were highly critical of the government for selling butter to Communist consumers at prices below those paid by Canadians for the same stuff.

Canada also knows how it feels to be trying to hold large stocks of wheat off the market in an effort to influence the price—we tried to do it in the early 1930's.

Underlying the whole problem of competition in grain sales between Canada and the

United States; Canada has exactly the same advantage in exporting wheat that the United States has over Canada in exporting automobiles—an efficient industry with high volume and low unit costs.

The effect of the U.S. price support has been to hold in the U.S. grain industry farmers whose costs are so high they can't make money at the world price. This is what handicaps American commercial sales.

It's not superior virtue that puts Canada in this position. Our grain industry is a low-cost one partly because of climate and geography, partly because the wheat land of western Canada was settled later than the farm areas of the Midwest United States, with larger units of production and lower fixed costs.

Secret CIA Sessions With Congress Units Hit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation in the form of House Joint Resolution 211, that if enacted by Congress would provide for a joint congressional committee to serve as a "watchdog" over the activities of the CIA and our other intelligence and information agencies. Several of our colleagues have introduced similar legislation, and have expressed their concern over the lack of congressional scrutiny of our intelligence community. The public has joined in our fight for this needed legislation, and I would like to insert an article from the November 4 edition of the Evening Star that describes Congress' present too limited role in overseeing the activities of the CIA:

SECRET CIA SESSIONS WITH CONGRESS UNITS

The agents from the Central Intelligence Agency take their places outside the door in a lobby of Congress.

Their Director sits in. A few of his aids follow. Then come a handful of Congress Members and a single committee staff man to help them.

But no one else goes by.

The Director, John McCone, briefs the Congress Members on CIA activities. He and his aids then field questions for 2, perhaps 3 hours. No one keeps a record.

The session ends, and the Congress Members hurry back to their offices, their new knowledge locked to themselves.

This procedure, repeated perhaps two dozen times a year, is the one through which Congress keeps its eye on the vast, varied and secret operations of the CIA.

Representative LINDSAY, Republican of New York, who is not a participant in any of these sessions, is not satisfied with them. "We are working in the dark," he says, "or at least in the semidark."

Mr. LINDSAY and some colleagues have proposed that Congress create a joint Senate-House committee, with a full staff, to supervise closely the activities of the CIA.

But other Members of the Congress, especially those who attend the sessions, say the supervision is adequate. And they add that the CIA is far too secret and sensitive an operation to have Congress constantly peering over its shoulder.

1963

Whereas a changing attitude in regard to narcotic addiction has been recently apparent in statements from the American Medical Association and from certain Federal health agencies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Indiana State Medical Association, That:

1. That the Indiana State Medical Association shall convey to the American Medical Association and to all Indiana Representatives and Senators in Congress its concern about the growing problem of narcotic addiction and its firm conviction that progress toward the control of this problem will come only upon its recognition as a medical problem and the removal of a profit incentive from the distribution of narcotics.

2. That this association offers its full support and cooperation to the American Medical Association and other health agencies in the study of this problem, with a view to the revision of existing laws and administrative rules and attitudes.

3. That the individual members of this association are encouraged to lend their support to the study and solution of this problem by exerting their influence as doctors and citizens in their local communities.

The Staff of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, it is strange but when all the chips are down, the world awakens to the simple but forceful truth. After all the bombs, propaganda, tensions and tumult, life still depends upon the needs of the human body and wheat becomes a symbol of these needs as bitter antagonists in the world of power politics sit down to a peaceful deal for the sale and the purchase of this most basic of all human needs, food.

One may applaud the gesture on our part as humanitarian except for the attempt to justify trading with the enemy by placing this wheat deal on purely an economic base.

How much better for the conscience of America, the propaganda of our friendly allies, and the pages of history, if we met the need of our competitor for world leadership and supremacy, for wheat, and added this to our long list of charity, giveaway, foreign aid, mutual assistance or what have you. We continue to hide behind our sagging balance of payments in trade, our disappearing gold reserve and our unbalanced budget, our continuing and vexing wheat surplus and plainly our inability to face up to the truth. We cannot seem to make up our minds as to whether we have convinced our peoples or not, on the justification for this extraordinary deal.

For myself, as a citizen not a lawmaker, as an American, not as a citizen of all countries, this deal leaves me cold. I have been taught, I have been scheduled to the point of no return in hatred of communism and all its related evils. I find no room in my normal feelings toward others when it comes to the Communist nations.

Dealing with, associating with, trading with Communists have been taboo in our American way and I find little to cheer me up in the statements of our leaders that take this transaction in about the same light as they do any deal involving profit, convenience and new cover all; accommodation.

I have been led to believe that profits, political expediency and even tolerance are not to be given consideration when dealing with the deadly foe, communism.

Our generation of Americans have been led to believe and have become convinced—I thought—of the deceit, the trickery and the brutality of communism.

I have listened but I have not been convinced by the following arguments. These are the reasons given for this wheat deal:

First. We will benefit by reducing our deficit balance of international payments.

Second. We will save the storage on a half million tons of wheat.

Third. If we do not sell to the Russians our friends and allies will.

Fourth. After all, it is humanitarian to sell the wheat, they had a bad crop and the little people need food.

Fifth. This will ease the cold war and we can cut down on our billions of defense spending.

Sixth. The Russian people will appreciate our big heartedness and our unselfish attitude.

Seventh. Cuba will not get any of this wheat.

Eighth. It will cut our surplus and cut our national deficit.

There may be more so-called grounds for our action but this much I know, none of the above reasons can be given for open trading with Russia and the satellites. Does anyone doubt the next step in our trade deals?

We have surplus or surplus capacity and surplus labor in any and all products produced here from apples to airplanes so all the above reasons are just as valid if and when we start trading in all other goods. There has to be another reason or two for the sudden trade deal because all the reasons mentioned above have been present a long, long time.

Do not get me wrong. I am no expert on this type of trading. All I ask, is that somewhere along the line someone ought to tell one when the Russians are bad and when they are good. When do we start building our bomb shelters or when do we start tearing down the shelters already built, is the \$64 question.

Just a few weeks ago Congress was convinced that we needed shelters and passed an act to help build public shelters. Maybe we can save this money now.

There is only one sound Christian and logical reason for giving wheat to Russia. We will help to feed her people if they are hungry.

We can excuse the deal only on the humanitarian base and none other so far as conscience is concerned. To say they could buy it elsewhere does not qualify the sale since they buy many millions of dollars worth of goods elsewhere

that we can supply. Does this open up free trade with communism?

Flour should be given as a gift of charity to a needy human being not on the basis of dollars or other benefits for propaganda. We have put \$108 billion into our efforts to lead the world and to create a peaceful coexistence, what is a couple of dollars more?

Do not forget that this talk of selling through private exporters is only to cover up the fact that Congress forbids the sale of subsidized agricultural products to Communist nations. The only way you can sell wheat is if the Government sells it to you. So we close our eyes and say it is not Government selling. Who owns the wheat?

This means that the handful of licensed wheat brokers who have no wheat except Government subsidized wheat are all of a sudden placed outside of the congressional ban on trading with the enemy in forbidden fruits.

It also means that approximately 60 cents on every bushel sold to the Communist nations comes out of the pockets of American taxpayers. Every bushel of wheat sold outside the United States costs the taxpayer about 60 cents.

Do not believe the story of reducing storage costs because this year's crop or next spring's will more than fill the hole left by this sale. If you don't cure the cause of the surplus you will never stop it with a one-shot cut price wheat sale.

The real cut in surplus will come from the defeat of the wheat referendum by the farmers since many large farmers will cut back. Next year, unless the Russians have another crop failure, or worse if they decide it is cheaper to barter with us for wheat to free their economy for more war material, the surplus will be right back where it started if our farmers do not cut back their planting. They will, since the easy money is from subsidy.

This deal reminds me of the story of the young Irish Patriot who when captured by the British was sentenced to be hanged publicly. Right before the trap was sprung he was offered his life if he would disclose his comrades and their hiding places.

He asked only one question. He said "You give me my life, for how long?" Since they could not answer the question he died with his pride and patriotism.

In closing I have this to say to my fellow Americans. I would be the last to condemn giving food to the needy no matter their color or creed or political persuasion. But I would give the wheat, not sell it. I would give it in paper bags, ground into flour with a picture of Uncle Sam on one side and a copy of our Declaration of Independence on the other.

Certainly the Russian people would get the food and the message.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I call to your attention a news story printed in the Financial Post, Toronto, Canada, October 19, 1963.

It appears that our friendly neighbors to the North appear displeased by our wheat action. One wonders why it is that "trade" can stir up the wrath of people and nations quicker than any other endeavor.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A6999

What is the present supervision like? Does Congress look long and hard enough? How many hours? Who does the job?

Some aspects of Government surveillance are almost as hush-hush as CIA operations, but here is the partial picture pieced together from congressional sources:

Three congressional subcommittees have jurisdiction over either the operations or appropriations of the CIA.

The Senate has a six-man subcommittee made up of members of the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees. The House has two subcommittees, one made up of 10 members of the Armed Services Committee, the other of an unknown number of members of the Appropriations Committee.

The House Armed Services Subcommittee on the CIA is headed by Representative VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, and includes Representatives L. MENDEL RIVERS, Democrat, of South Carolina; HEBERT, Democrat, of Louisiana; PRICE, Democrat, of Illinois; CHARLES E. BENNETT, Democrat, of Florida; HUDDLESTON, Democrat, of Alabama; AREND, Republican, of Illinois; BRAY, Republican, of Indiana; BOB WILSON, Republican, of California; and OSMERS, Republican, of New Jersey.

Representative NORBLAD, Republican, of Oregon, who was a member of this subcommittee several years ago, recently told the House "We met annually, one time a year, for a period of 2 hours in which we accomplished virtually nothing."

But a present member of the subcommittee, who would not allow his name to be used, said the group now meets at least once a month with Mr. McCone and has "Frank, open, and wide discussions" lasting as long as 3 hours.

He said the subcommittee does not go into every detail of CIA operations but surveys the significant activities.

No stenographic record is kept at these sessions, which do not touch on specific appropriations for the CIA.

This is left in the hands of the Appropriations Subcommittee, which hides the CIA appropriation—believed to be more than a half-billion dollars a year—among the appropriations of various other agencies so neither the rest of Congress nor the public can know exactly how much money the Agency gets.

WON'T REVEAL NAMES

The House Appropriations Committee refuses to reveal which of its members belong to the CIA Subcommittee and how many times they meet a year.

But it is a safe guess that it meets with Mr. McCone about the same number of times as the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee and that its membership includes at least Representative CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, chairman of the full committee, and Representatives MAHON, Democrat, of Texas, and FORD, Republican, of Michigan.

The members of the Senate's CIA Subcommittee are Senators RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia; HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia; STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi; SALTONSTALL, Republican, of Massachusetts; HAYDEN, Democrat, of Arizona, and MILTON R. YOUNG, Republican, of North Dakota.

The least number of times they have met with the CIA chief in a year has been two; the most, six.

On occasion, some committee other than the three CIA subcommittees moves into the CIA act.

Just recently, for example, the House Foreign Affairs Committee had a session with Mr. McCone and John Richardson, the former head of CIA operations in Vietnam.

Khrushchev Denies Quitting Race To Put First Man on Moon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the enigmatical Mr. Khrushchev is like a pendulum. He swings back and forth from light to dark.

In the Washington Post of yesterday appeared the story which is below.

It is less than a week ago that the papers were carrying stories to the effect that the Russians were not going to the moon and many of those who do not understand the moon program and some who do not want to understand the moon program hailed this apparent decision by the Russians. I would like to again state that this country is not in a moon race with Russia or any other country.

In the exploration of outer space, we use the moon as a steppingstone, and the techniques which we are developing to go to the moon and to rendezvous vehicles in space are invaluable in the further exploration of space. These techniques will be invaluable to our defense effort.

Before the pendulous Mr. Khrushchev swings back to his alleged position, let us disavow completely his phony leadership.

It begins to look as if the whole setup was one to confuse and lead our people astray.

The article is as follows:

KHRUSHCHEV DENIES QUITTING RACE TO PUT FIRST MAN ON MOON

Moscow, November 6.—Premier Nikita Khrushchev denied today the impression of a U.S. businessman that the Soviet Union had given up plans to put a man on the moon.

Kendrick R. Wilson, Jr., chairman of the board of the Avco Corp., who was one of 20 Americans visiting the Kremlin, asked the Russian leader:

"Why have you given up the idea of going to the moon? Was it for economic reasons? Khrushchev disclaimed any such thought.

"We have never said we are giving up our lunar project," he said. "You're the ones who said that.

"And when we talk about the technical possibilities of doing this, and when we have complete confidence that whoever is sent to the moon can safely be sent back, then it is quite feasible, quite possible. When, I don't know.

"As for the economic difficulties, you keep on expecting us to give up our (moon) program. Well, gentlemen, I say give up such hopes once and for all and just throw them away.

"The economic situation within our country is excellent today * * * and in the future it will be still better."

The exchange was a sequel to publication by the Government newspaper Izvestia October 26 of a statement by Khrushchev that the Soviet Union was not racing to be first to land on the moon.

This was subject to various interpretations in the West, though Khrushchev made it clear Russian scientists were pursuing research for a lunar landing. As quoted by Izvestia, he said:

"At the present time we are not planning flights of cosmonauts to the moon. Soviet scientists are working on this problem. * * * I have read reports that the Americans want to land on the moon by 1970. Well, we wish them success. * * * We will study their experience."

The American visitors asked Khrushchev how long it will take the Soviet Union to achieve a rendezvous in space.

"We have no calendar program, no definite date for a rendezvous in space," Khrushchev said.

Veto in Sight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Washington, D.C., Daily News of November 5, 1963, entitled "Veto in Sight," warning simply that the comments by the President at his press conference the other day with regard to the so-called quality stabilization bill indicate that a veto threatens any such legislation of this kind that Congress should pass.

It would appear plain to all that Congress should simply disregard any legislation so unwise as this and so dangerous to the consumer and the small businessman in view of the certain veto facing this legislation:

VETO IN SIGHT

Since late July, the House has tied on its calendar the so-called quality stabilization bill. This is the renamed price-fixing scheme for drugs and other brand products.

According to the fussy language which goes with this legislation, the bill would wipe out cut-throat competition in the retail business, get the consumers better products and lower prices, save the "small" businessman from extinction and in other ways benefit the general welfare and prosperity.

But the aim of the bill is still the same—to fix prices, up.

It attempts to do on a national scale what some States have done, at a high cost to consumers, and which other States tried, only to have the laws declared unconstitutional by their courts.

Any manufacturer, under this bill, who puts out a product with his name on it could lay down the law to any retailer who offered the product for sale. The retailer would charge the manufacturer's price, or else. And the U.S. Government would help him enforce his edict.

The Justice Department, the Federal Trade Commission and other branches of the Government are opposed to the bill. President Kennedy says the officials who have testified against it "have spoken my view."

He coupled this statement with a remark that he couldn't "comment" on any legislation until it gets to his desk. But in the name of consistency, he would have to veto it. It conflicts with the spirit of all the anti-trust, anti-price-fixing laws now on the books, and with the general policies of the Kennedy administration.

This should mean that the bill now on the House Calendar is merely an exercise in futility. Every consumer will hope so.

The Heritage of Pulaski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the deeds accomplished by Gen. Casimir Pulaski in our country during the Revolutionary War are remembered each year during Pulaski Day celebrations.

At this year's Pulaski Day commemoration in Milwaukee, Wis., a student from Don Bosco High School delivered an address which is remarkable for its lucidity and is an excellent summation of Pulaski's heritage.

As the student, Alexander Sklenarz, points out, today, more than ever, we need the virtues which motivated Pulaski—unselfishness, indomitable courage, readiness to sacrifice, and patriotism.

The heritage of Pulaski, who was quick to fight against oppression on any soil and continent, can be remembered here in the United States where his participation in the American Revolution is an example of his legacy.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the following speech delivered by this student in Milwaukee on October 19 to the attention of my colleagues:

We are gathered here to commemorate a hero of two continents, the great soldier of liberty, who died in the American Revolution to establish the liberties which we cherish today. Casimir Pulaski gave his life for the cause of American independence. He was one of those rare souls whose selfless devotion becomes a symbol for lovers of freedom everywhere.

Born to wealth and privilege, he sacrificed both in the struggle for the freedom of his native land and of America. He always fought for principles and ideals. He sought no personal advantages, no rewards and he found none. His life is a story of reverses, defeats, privations, and disasters.

From the pages of the 18th century history of Poland, comes a picture of a troubled and unhappy land. Gone were the days when Poland controlled the whole of Eastern Europe from the Baltic to the Black Sea. Gone were those days when the Polish cavalry under King Jan Sobieski at Vienna had delivered the crushing blow against the Turks and thus freed Europe from the menace of Islam. Due to an unfavorable geographic position and unfortunate political circumstances, the Polish King Stanislas August Poniatowski and his government became mere pawns in the hands of the Russians, who under the pretenses of a friendly interest, introduced their armies into Poland. There were Russian garrisons in Warsaw and in other principal cities of the country. Nobody can deny that history repeats itself. Only then it was Empress Catherine not Khrushchev, but the pretenses were the same, the same foreign power, the same terror, and the same violation of all Polish liberties.

It was during these times that Casimir Pulaski appeared in public life to again bring glory upon Polish arms, to defy Russian oppression, and to unfurl the banner of real freedom and independence.

By the time he was 21, he was to defeat the Russians in several battles and by the time he was 24 he was to have a European reputation as a sincere patriot and a hard and resourceful fighter. The noble Confed-

eration of Bar under the banner "For the Faith and Liberty" could not save Poland against the overwhelming power of Russian armies, stationed in Poland, but the heroic battles raging from the eastern parts of Poland at the Castle of Okopy to the holy shrine of Czestochowa—again awakened the patriotic spirit of the nation and the hope that Poland would be free from foreign domination.

On the night of May 31, 1772, Casimir Pulaski was forced to leave Poland and fate willed that he was not to see his beloved fatherland again.

Three years later in 1775, the first shots of the Battle of Lexington reached him in France. They were followed by the tale of Bunker Hill, by the calling of the Continental Congress, and by the beginning of a full-sized war. Here again was a war against tyrants and Pulaski heard and understood the battle cry.

His passionate love of freedom, his desire to fight against oppression on any soil and continent, brought Pulaski to America with a letter of recommendation from Benjamin Franklin to George Washington.

It was here at the Battle of Brandywine that Pulaski, at the head of a small cavalry detachment, won his first laurels in America and on September 15, 1777, Congress voted to commission him as a brigadier general and commander of the horse. It was a path of fame which took Pulaski with the legion of his name to South Carolina and his later death at the siege of Savannah at the head of French forces and American cavalry.

Thus Casimir Pulaski sealed his devotion to America with his life and his blood. He was dead at the age of 32 and he died as he would have wished—in the thick of battle for liberty, for those ideals which had doomed his father and his brother.

He had finished his course and he left behind him a noble memory in two countries separated by the ocean but bound by the common ties of love of freedom. Perhaps no tribute was greater than that of his foe, King Stanislas August Poniatowski: "Pulaski has died as he lived—a hero—but an enemy of kings."

Casimir Pulaski by his heroic life and deeds on the field of glory left a great heritage to both the Polish and American nations.

It was not for the last time that Poles fought outside Poland against tyrants and against oppression. After the partition of Poland the unbounded love of freedom attracted thousands of Polish soldiers to the banners of General Dabrowski in Italy. They carried a proud motto on their banners: "For your freedom and ours." And on their epaulets a sentence, "All freemen are brothers." It was amidst their ranks that the immortal Polish national anthem was born.

It was again after the uprisings of 1830 and 1863 that Polish freedom fighters were forced to leave Poland and fought in the ranks of other nations.

An American, Paul Super in his book the "Polish Tradition" says in that respect: "In what army of what nation seeking liberty have the Poles not fought? What war for freedom has their sacrifice and death not hallowed? In what land have Poles not died for this to them dearest of all rights? No important soil of Europe but covers their bones, while their part in the American war for national freedom is known to every American schoolboy."

But the greatest exodus happened in 1939 when a large Polish army, reborn outside of Poland like Phoenix from the ashes, numbering over 100,000 men, with a Polish Air Force and a Polish Navy joined the Western Allies in the mortal struggle against Hitlerism. On all theaters of the war the Polish forces took part in the famous and decisive

battles at Narvik, Tobruk, Monte Cassino, Bologna, and Falaise. Thousands of Poles fell in these battles and sacrificed their lives in the vain hope that Poland would regain full freedom.

But today, like in the days of Casimir Pulaski, the government in Warsaw takes its orders from Russia. Only the name of the Russian Ambassador in Warsaw has changed and it is no more Catherine but Khrushchev who imposes his will upon the Polish nation.

In the arsenal of each nation virtues are the most important and decisive weapons. This is the wealth of our heritage; this is our stockpiled arsenal of spiritual strength. We Americans have a long history of struggle; each page of our history is full of heroism. From Lexington to Iwo Jima, there has been interwoven a red thread of blood which like the thread of Ariadne has led the American Nation through the labyrinth of times of confusion, trial and hazards.

Today the whole world is looking toward us and we are acclaimed the champions of freedom. In the gigantic struggle between two ideologies, which encompass the whole world and all fields of human activities: political, economic and cultural—we must constantly be on our guard and always ready to fight for the ideals on which our Western civilization is founded. Today more than ever we need the virtues which motivated Pulaski: unselfishness, indomitable courage, readiness to sacrifice and patriotism.

We are looking confidently into the future because we know and firmly believe that only love of freedom breeds patriotism—only patriotism assures victory.

ALEXANDER SKLENARZ,
Don Bosco High School,
Milwaukee, Wis.

False Assumptions in the District Crime Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 8, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago the House approved the District crime bill. At that time a great many Members voiced their objections to that bill on both policy and constitutional grounds.

Even were it possible to dilute the Constitution by statutory enactments, still, the case made in behalf of a change in judicial policy is not well grounded. It erroneously assumes the existence of certain causal relationships between court procedures and the commission of crimes.

The District has a fine police force; they are not to be blamed for the present crime rate in the District. Police officials rightfully resent being made the scapegoats in these situations; why do they then engage in the same tactic by castigating the courts and the law?

These points were explored more fully by Prof. Yale Kamisar, of the Minnesota Law School, in a paper prepared for delivery at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, in August. Professor Kamisar makes the incontrovertible point that civil liberties are not incorporated in our Constitution only to be bent to the expediences of the

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 109

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1963

No. 163

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, October 14, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

Senate

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1963

(Legislative day of Thursday, October 10, 1963)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, frail children of earth's fleeting scenes, we lift lame hands of prayer to Thee who art from everlasting to everlasting. From the grinding daily schedules which drain our strength and enmesh our hearts and minds, we would for these dedicated moments gaze up and out to the eternal principles which give worth and meaning to all that is said or done here.

Purge our hearts of unworthy entanglements and shabby selfish motives which may mar and blot the future's broadening way. In a world that has become a neighborhood, and which we must make a brotherhood or perish, join us to the increasing legion that across the boundaries of prejudice, intolerance, and hatred, extends the dominion of healing good will. Out of the ruins of mankind's shattered hopes, may Thy kingdom come. Thou who through storm and night art still guarding and guiding, to Thee aloud we cry, God save the state.

We ask it in the Name that is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 10, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 8747) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 8747) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee, of the Committee on Government Operations, was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a morning hour, limited to the introduction of bills, resolutions, and statements by Senators not to exceed 3 minutes, and not to extend beyond 12:15 p.m.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2232. A bill to amend title 1 of the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize additional payments thereunder in certain additional cases for losses resulting from the displacement of property from an urban renewal area; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2233. A bill for the relief of Margaret Rose Owen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 2234. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of an analytical research experiment station at Frederick, Md., to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Brewster when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING:

S.J. Res. 127. Joint resolution for the relief of certain Yugoslav refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Keating when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

CREATION OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN INFORMATION AND INTELLIGENCE

Mr. McCARTHY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 213) creating the Select Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. McCARTHY, which appears under a separate heading.)

18363

ANALYTICAL RESEARCH EXPERIMENT STATION, FREDERICK, MD.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which has been submitted and recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, to provide for the establishment and operation of an analytical research experiment station at Frederick, Md.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior explaining the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2234) to provide for the establishment and operation of an analytical research experiment station at Frederick, Md., introduced by Mr. BREWSTER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letter presented by Mr. BREWSTER is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., September 9, 1963.
Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the establishment and operation of an analytical research experiment station at Frederick, Md.

We recommend that this bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and that it be enacted.

The proposed bill would provide authority for the Secretary of the Interior to establish, equip, and maintain a research laboratory at Frederick, Md., to advance the conservation, development, and utilization of minerals by conducting investigations of precise analytical techniques essential to the effective pursuit of metallurgical research and applying newly developed knowledge in the preparation and identification of minerals substances of extraordinary purity and exact composition.

The Department has authority for the establishment of this facility under the act of March 3, 1915 (38 Stat. 959; 30 U.S.C. 8), which directs the Secretary of the Interior to establish and maintain the facilities necessary to the conduct of programs of the Bureau of Mines, and we have utilized this authority many times since enactment. During consideration of the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill for 1964 the House Committee on Appropriations and the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, stated that specific authorization should be obtained from the Congress, after consideration by the appropriate legislative committees, for the establishment of a new facility. Under these circumstances, we are submitting the proposed bill for consideration and recommend its enactment.

Extraordinarily pure and precisely compounded substances derived from mineral sources frequently have significantly different properties than similar substances of ordinary or commercial composition. Desirable qualities attainable by achieving new dimensions in purity include unique strength at extreme temperatures, impact resistance in frigid cold, ability to sustain repeated and prolonged shocks and loads, durability in corrosive and erosive environments, and predicted and controlled response to light, magnetism, electricity, and nuclear particles.

For continued progress in this evolving field an urgent need has become evident for developing reliable, precise techniques for

the identification and measurement of a few unwanted atoms in an otherwise pure substance. Requirements of new electronic, nuclear and metallurgical applications for materials of transcendental purity demand analytical sensitivity a thousandfold or more exact than obtainable by conventional procedures. Research at the proposed facility in the development of precise, accurate analytical techniques will help the Bureau of Mines keep pace with the increasingly stringent materials demands of the Nation's scientific and defense program.

This need for more rapid analytical procedures to increase productivity and regulate improved quality in the mining and processing of minerals and metals has been accentuated by the trend toward centralized control and automation. Research at Frederick will be aimed at increased speed and ultrahigh precision in analysis of routine samples and toward development of techniques and apparatus for continuously probing and analyzing gaseous, liquid, and solid substances in transit and in process.

The Center will be staffed and equipped to provide—

1. A capability for determining the elemental composition of materials and for development of new techniques of more rapid, accurate, and sensitive analysis.

2. A capability for determining the atomic, and molecular arrangements and crystal structure in the substances being examined and in pure materials and compounds;

3. A capability for measuring thermodynamic, kinetic, and thermoelectric properties of materials of precisely known composition and structures; and

4. A capability for preparation of organic, inorganic, metallo-organic, cermets, and polymeric materials of precise composition.

The availability of optical, electronic, nuclear particle, and analogous highly specialized equipment and virtually sterile laboratory facilities for the first three items will provide an attendant opportunity and capacity for item (4).

The Bureau's effort and corollary activity by industry, and other Government agencies in this scientific field will be strengthened and accelerated by the new research center's abilities for concerted attention to the solution of pressing analytical and determinative problems.

The 87th Congress appropriated funds for planning and designing a facility at Frederick, Md. The funds for this limited purpose were transferred to the General Services Administration by the Department of the Interior. The initial planning and the architect-engineer contract for this project were negotiated and are being administered by the General Services Administration. We plan to utilize the services of the General Services Administration for construction of the buildings in the same manner.

The proposed bill would authorize an appropriation of (a) \$2,500,000 for the erection and equipment of a building or buildings; and (b) such sums as are necessary annually for the maintenance and operation of the station. It is estimated that the annual appropriation for the first 5 years will be less than \$1 million.

In the hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 87th Congress, 2d session, which preceded the appropriation, it was stated:

"In the whole materials area the single most inhibiting factor in the development and use of metals and alloys is the inadequacy of known analytical methods and analytical devices.

"Trace analysis, the measurement of a few unwanted atoms in an otherwise pure solid, is the most critical area in the entire spectrum of materials research. Although methods have been developed to allow routine analyses of impurities in quantities of only

parts per million, the requirements of new electronic and metallurgical applications demanding ultra-high-purity materials have multiplied sensitivity requirements to mere parts per billion. Products now can be obtained in such pure form that they often surpass the limits of current analytical techniques.

"Without constant honing of the sensitivity and accuracy of established analytical techniques and continued development of new methods we cannot keep pace with the demands imposed by the Nation's scientific and defense materials program. The Bureau of Mines proposes to accent its endeavors in this vital area. An integrated five-point program will be initiated, including improvements of preconcentration methods, utilization of radioactive tracer and activation analysis techniques, application of new scientific analytical instruments such as the recently developed atomic absorption spectrometer and solid analysis mass spectrometer, development of improved measurement instruments, and fundamental investigation of new concepts of impurity detection.

"The Bureau of Mines proposes the establishment of a new center where talents and efforts can be concentrated upon this critical problem and to which research scientists in the Government, private research institutions, and industry can look for solution of analytical problems."

By contributing to the technological advancement of U.S. industry in the preparation and quality control of minerals, metals, and fuels, the Bureau program at Frederick would encourage and sustain U.S. leadership in this important area of our economy. The proposed new facility would help to maintain a preeminent position in minerals production and utilization.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this draft bill from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN M. KELLY,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN YUGOSLAV REFUGEES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution for the relief of certain Yugoslav crewmen who are seeking political asylum in this country. These men are faced with forceable deportation unless Congress acts in their behalf. Before returning these men to a Communist state I feel that a full inquiry should be made into the equities of each case. The joint resolution I am introducing will provide the basis for such a procedure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 127) for the relief of certain Yugoslav refugees, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN INFORMATION AND INTELLIGENCE

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I have long held that a joint committee of Congress was necessary to exercise continuing supervision over the Central Intelligence Agency. For whatever reason

it appears that Congress is reluctant to create such a joint committee. On a number of occasions while I was a Member of the House of Representatives I introduced bills to create a joint committee on foreign information and intelligence. I have introduced Senate Joint Resolution 61 in this Congress which is similar to the resolutions I have introduced in previous Congresses for the creation of such a committee. A number of other Senators and Representatives have introduced comparable resolutions.

Considerable public attention has been focused upon the Central Intelligence Agency as a result of the problems we are encountering in South Vietnam. Numerous questions have also been raised about the knowledge which we had concerning the recent military takeovers in the Dominican Republic and Honduras.

On Sunday, October 6, the New York Times published an editorial entitled "State Within a State?" concerning the Central Intelligence Agency. The editorial called for the appointment of a joint committee on intelligence.

James Reston, in the same issue of the New York Times, devoted his column to the Central Intelligence Agency and some of the problems it is encountering.

The Washington Post of October 8 called for a congressional inquiry into the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article and editorials be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 6, 1963]

STATE WITHIN A STATE?

Is the Central Intelligence Agency a state within a state?

President Kennedy's recall of the head of CIA operations in South Vietnam, coming after persistent reports of discord between him and Ambassador Lodge, appears to provide substantial corroboration to the long-voiced charges that our intelligence organization too often tends to make policy.

The CIA is a large and, on the whole, well-organized intelligence apparatus, which knows and employs all the tricks of the trade. But it not only gathers intelligence; it operates saboteurs, guerrillas, and other paramilitary forces. And its operations—particularly if they are not carefully programed, controlled, and directed—tend willy-nilly to influence policy, if not to make it.

The Agency has many extremely able men. But it operates behind the cloak of anonymity and secrecy—and secrecy adds to power. When the same organization collects intelligence and evaluates it, and, at the same time, conducts clandestine operations—and when that organization is as powerful and as well financed as the CIA—there is an inevitable tendency for some of its personnel to assume the functions of kingmakers.

Communist imperialism and the exigencies of the nuclear age have brought us close away—whether we like it or not—from the era of 1929, when Secretary of State Stimson closed the Nation's only code-breaking organization with the remark that "gentlemen do not read each other's mail." Today we must read the other fellow's mail if we want to survive.

A joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence, so long urged but so often frustrated by congressional pride of place and petty jealousies, should be established to monitor our intelligence services, to safe-

guard their security and to reduce the dangers secret espionage and covert operations present to a free society.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 6, 1963]
HOW TO MAKE THINGS WORSE THAN THEY REALLY ARE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, October 5.—John McCone, the headman at the Central Intelligence Agency, is discovering in Vietnam, as his predecessor, Allen Dulles, did in Cuba, that running a secret service for a big, gabby country is a very dicey business.

He is now accused publicly of differing with his Government's policy in Saigon, which he denies, and he takes the whole controversy so seriously that he has convinced himself that there is a conspiracy inside the Government and in the press to destroy his Agency.

This is a serious thing if true, for the cold war is in part a war of insurgency and counterinsurgency, and in such a war an effective secret service is increasingly important. But so far as can be determined here, there is no evidence of any conspiracy either by or against the CIA in Vietnam.

AN OLD DISPUTE

There is a jurisdictional dispute between the CIA and the State and Defense Departments. There always has been. State has always been afraid CIA would not restrict itself to the gathering of intelligence but would go beyond that to interpret their intelligence in such a way as to influence or make policy.

Similarly, the Defense Department has always been afraid the CIA would get into the field of actual operations, as it did in Cuba. Thus, State and Defense, jealous of their policy and operations functions, respectively, have always been suspicious of CIA and prone to complain to the press whenever they think they see evidence of encroachment.

These feelings were savagely pressed in the first Cuban crisis. They have been heard again about Vietnam, but the analogy with Cuba is misleading.

No doubt McCone and his headman in Saigon, John H. Richardson, who has now been called home, have strong views about both policy and operations in Vietnam. It would be surprising if they didn't.

The CIA was deeply involved in Vietnam long before the 14,000 U.S. troops were sent there. The CIA helped train the Vietnamese Army. And they were already close to President Diem and his brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu, before President Kennedy made his decision that a major counterinsurgency operation should be launched in Vietnam.

Thus, by the time the Buddhist temples were raided, starting the present crisis, the CIA, State and Defense officials were not only operating in Saigon but were deeply involved emotionally and had different views about how the United States should react to the raids.

The differing views, however, did not always follow the party line of the three government agencies. Some men in State thought a major effort should be made to force changes in the policies and personnel of the Diem government. Others thought that while such changes were desirable, they could not be forced without weakening the war effort. But these conflicting views existed within all three agencies, including the CIA in Saigon, and President Kennedy himself first supported the first line and then the second.

This was not, then, an Alfred Hitchcock spectacular involving the CIA versus the Rest. It was an honest difference over whether a purge of the Diem government was possible and whether such a purge would or would not help the war effort.

M'CONE'S SENSITIVITY

The State Department, for example, against the judgment of some of its own people but with the support of most of its top officials, issued a private directive in support of trying to force a change in the Diem government.

It did not check this out with CIA to see whether CIA's intelligence would show that such a purge could be forced. Nor did it tell the Defense Department about the directive. So CIA and Defense, which in general were not for trying the purge, were not amused.

What is surprising about all this is that McCone should be so surprised and tender about the criticism and the belated efforts of the White House to tidy things up.

This country is always going to be suspicious of any Government secret service agency, especially after Cuba, and it is likely to get all the more suspicious when the spooks see a great conspiracy in the reporting of their activities.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 8, 1963]

OUR MAN IN SAIGON

The recall of the CIA chieftain in South Vietnam should not be an occasion for recrimination. It should be an occasion for some useful reconsideration of the general role of an intelligence agency in foreign affairs. Ambassador Lodge is reportedly concerned about the prevailing arrangement that makes the CIA both an intelligence-gathering organization and an operational agency in the field. Mr. Lodge is not alone in his concern.

In theory, within the CIA, the intelligence and operational activities are kept separate. In practice, the two functions cannot be kept apart so easily; experience has shown that agency operatives in the field have a tendency to use intelligence to support an operational decision. The result, too often, is that Washington receives neither impartial intelligence nor benefits from operations based on a hard-headed perception of reality.

Clearly the CIA is at a disadvantage in any public debate of its activities; the agency cannot speak for itself. Success often goes unnoticed; failure just as often may lead to an exaggeration of the CIA's responsibility. This is the price that secrecy exacts. But public concern in the Agency's performance is legitimate and should not be equated with an attempt to smear or to impeach the motives of any CIA official.

What is sorely needed is a thorough and fair overall study of the intelligence community. Such an inquiry ought to deal with rivalry between the CIA and the Defense Intelligence Agency. It ought to draw on experience in other countries where intelligence and operational activities are linked with separate organizational entities. And Congress should take the initiative in launching such a study.

For too many years, Members of Congress have closed their eyes to the need for legislative scrutiny into intelligence operations. Yet who else can do the job? The public lacks the facts; the administration has a record to defend; the agency cannot be expected to study itself. Enough has come to light to justify an impartial inquiry, which might properly be conducted by a special legislative commission drawing on members of both chambers and upon private citizens of stature and experience.

If an investigation should discover no grounds for changing the present arrangement, public apprehension would be lessened. If an investigation should disclose need for basic changes, then the country might be saved from future embarrassment. In either case, the United States would be the gainer and Congress would have discharged a duty that it has been far too reluctant to perform.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the time has come for Congress if it will

not establish a joint committee or a continuing committee, to appoint a special committee or select committee to conduct an immediate investigation into all the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency and its organization, particularly those activities which have been attributed to the Agency in South Vietnam and, at the present time, in Central and South America.

Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution which would create a select committee of the Senate to conduct such an investigation and report to the Senate not later than January 31, 1964. I am hopeful that the Senate will take action on the resolution immediately.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Watchdog for CIA," published in the Washington Daily News of October 8, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATCHDOG FOR CIA

Though bad blood among U.S. agencies in South Vietnam is officially denied, the fact remains that the head of Central Intelligence Agency operations in that country has been called home for consultations.

And that this recall promptly follows the return of Defense Secretary McNamara and Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor from an investigation of affairs in South Vietnam.

The facts concerning this intelligence organization are exceedingly hard to come by, and properly so. No reasonable person would expect the CIA to publicize its operation. Any such policy would destroy its usefulness.

But an excess of secrecy, we suggest, is good neither for the country nor the CIA which, under present arrangements, isn't even accountable to Congress.

Even the top-secret Atomic Energy Commission comes under the view of a joint committee of Congress, the members of which committee are able to influence, defend, and interpret the policies of AEC without exposing any of its secrets.

Proposals to establish a similar committee for CIA repeatedly have fizzled out without action. Congress should be prompted by current events to establish such a committee.

The CIA operation, admittedly highly necessary under present world conditions, is something relatively new for the United States and is accepted reluctantly by a free society. But minimum congressional supervision is essential to public confidence that it operates effectively and stays within the bounds of its avowed mission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 213) was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be known as the Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence and to consist of nine Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate as soon as practicable after the date of adoption of this resolution.

Sec. 2. It shall be the duty of such committee to make a full and complete investigation and study of the Central Intelligence Agency and to report its findings and recommendations to the Senate no later than January 31, 1964. No proposed legislation shall be referred to such committee, and such committee shall not have power to report by bill or otherwise have legislative jurisdiction.

Sec. 3. The said committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

Sec. 4. A majority of the members of the committee or any subcommittee thereof shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

Sec. 5. The committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duty. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the various departments and agencies of the Government to the extent that such services, information, facilities, and personnel, in the opinion of the heads of such departments and agencies, can be furnished without undue interference with the performance of the work and duties of such departments and agencies. The committee is authorized to procure, by contract or otherwise, the services of public or private organizations or institutions.

Sec. 6. The expenses of the committee, in an amount not to exceed \$200,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

ASSISTANCE TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 222)

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me, to H.R. 6143, the higher education bill. I ask that it be ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. President, this amendment would add a new title to the bill which would allow an income tax deduction for tuition and fees paid to institutions of higher education. It represents a revision of a bill I introduced earlier this year (S. 1236) to allow tax deductions for tuition and fee payments to educational institutions at all levels, whether public or private. The amendment now being sent to the desk differs from my original bill in two major respects. First, instead of a flat \$300 per person maximum deduction, it would permit deduction of all tuition and fee payments in excess of 5 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income, with no fixed maximum. And secondly, in order to keep the amendment germane to the bill at hand, I have limited its application to payments for higher education only; but still without regard to whether the institution is public or private supported.

In advancing this amendment, I am fully aware objection will be raised that it basically affects the raising of revenue and therefore should not originate in the Senate. I am nevertheless putting it forward now so that it may stimulate renewed discussion of the virtues and feasibility of aiding all levels of education through the income tax structure. I also intend to obtain new Treasury Department reports on this and other tax deduction proposals so that, in the event

this particular amendment is withdrawn, defeated, or ruled out of order on constitutional grounds with respect to the higher education bill (H.R. 6143), I shall be prepared to reoffer it as an amendment to the tax bill, where, of course, it would be perfectly in order.

Let me just conclude by saying, as so many have said, that I know of no better way to further investment in higher education and to alleviate hardships to parents and students who these days must bear terrific expense, than by the tax deduction route, and, in my judgment, now is the right time to make a start down that road.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this amendment be printed following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 222) is to insert at the end of the bill, the following new title:

TITLE IV—INCOME TAX DEDUCTION FOR TUITION AND FEES PAID TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Allowance of deduction

SEC. 401. (a) Part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) is amended by renumbering section 217 as 218, and by inserting after section 216 the following new section:

"SEC. 217. TUITION AND FEES PAID TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

"(a) ALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTION.—In the case of an individual there shall be allowed as a deduction amounts paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year to an institution of higher education for tuition and fees for the attendance of the taxpayer, his spouse, or a dependent at such institution of higher education, but only to the extent the amounts so paid exceed 5 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income for the taxable year.

"(b) LIMITATION WITH RESPECT TO SPOUSE.—Deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) for amounts paid during the taxable year for tuition and fees for the spouse of the taxpayer only if—

"(1) the taxpayer is entitled to an exemption for his spouse under section 151 (b) for the taxable year, or

"(2) the taxpayer files a joint return with his spouse under section 6013 for the taxable year.

"(c) REDUCTION FOR CERTAIN SCHOLARSHIPS AND FELLOWSHIPS.—Amounts paid for tuition and fees with respect to any individual which (but for this subsection) would be taken into account under subsection (a) shall, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, be reduced by any amounts received by or for such individual during the taxable year as a scholarship or fellowship grant (within the meaning of section 117 (a) (1)) which under section 117 is not includible in gross income.

"(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) DEPENDENT.—The term 'dependent' has the meaning assigned it by section 152 (a).

"(2) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term 'institution of higher education' has the meaning assigned to it by section 301(a) of the College Academic Facilities Act.

"(e) TRADE OR BUSINESS EXPENSES.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any amount paid which is allowable as a deduction under

OCT 10 1963

Approved For Release 2005/06/06 : CIA-RDP71B00364R000600100006-5

m. 61,299
S. 193,108

Front Page Edit Page Other Page

Date:

CIA Reorganization Is Urged by Sen. Pell

By BRUCE E. VAN DUSEN
Journal-Bulletin Washington Bureau

Washington—Sen. Claiborne Pell, D-R.I., urged the Kennedy administration yesterday to re-vamp the Central Intelligence Agency by separating its intelligence gathering functions from its operational programs.

He said that as it is now organized the same persons who collect and analyze data for the super-secret agency also conduct its undercover operations.

Such a situation amounts to a "conflict of interest" and should be discontinued, the senator said in a Senate speech.

The remarks were moderately critical of the CIA and were added to a growing body of critical opinion in Congress during recent weeks.

Senator Pell's views differed from the general theme being expressed by other critics that the CIA needs closer supervision from Congress than it has been getting.

The U-2 affair, the Cuban invasion of 1961 and most recently the crisis in South Viet Nam all have sparked similar expressions of congressional concern.

Senator Pell's criticism was that while CIA intelligence collection and analysis have generally been excellent, the national intelligence has lost more than it has gained from its CIA operational activities.

This is particularly so if one takes into account the lives and dollars that have been lost in carrying out those activities, the senator said.

He said that after the Bay of Pigs fiasco "a board was set up and the general impression was that there would be drastic overhauls in our CIA," including the separation of which he spoke.

But not only does this centralization continue under the same roof in Washington, the CIA chiefs in the field ap-

pear to be carrying on the same "dual and conflicting responsibilities." Senator Pell added.

Finally, the senator said that although President Kennedy has made it plain that American ambassadors abroad should be responsible for all U.S. government activities in their country, the ambassador who can be fully aware of everything "is indeed a rare bird."

In the last session of Congress, Senator Pell co-sponsored

a resolution setting up a joint Senate-House committee to oversee the CIA. This year Sen. George A. Smathers, D-Fla. has sponsored a similar effort, and Senator Pell supports it.

After his speech, Senator Pell noted that the British Intelli-

gence service and others make a point of separating their data gathering and analyzing from their operational activities.

10/23/63 - Pforzheimer left the attached.

Wanted to make sure you saw it.

Jr Com. file

Marie

[Signature]

Approved For Release 2005/06/06 : CIA-RDP71B00364R000600100006-5

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18143

ure we are now considering. I believe a base plan of the type I suggested would have been an effective instrument in reducing surpluses, and as it did so, it would reward those dairy farmers who had reduced their production. There is no logic whatsoever in encouraging the production of \$3 milk in an area where producers need \$5 to \$6 to cover the cost of producing milk.

However, it soon became apparent during the hearings that my bill was too severe for any serious consideration. There was too much active opposition to it by major segments of the industry. As a matter of fact, even after the Department of Agriculture proposed less stringent language it was still thought too severe by some.

Be that as it may, the fact remains that my bill was unacceptable.

In its place, however, we have a bill, S. 1915, which I believe will be helpful over a period of years, in reducing production in market order areas. As a result we anticipate that there will be some savings to the taxpayer, and at the same time a slight increase in income to farmers.

I am a realist, therefore, I have given up hope on my bill. Instead, I support S. 1915, the measure now before the Senate, because it will accomplish some good.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for yielding to me.

SEPARATION OF INTELLIGENCE AND OPERATIONAL FUNCTIONS IN THE CIA

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the assessment of intelligence and the carrying out of covert or paramilitary operational activities are two very different functions. These days we often hear the words "conflict of interest." But, if there was ever a conflict of interest, it is when the same group of men, first, collect intelligence and make an assessment of the intelligence they have collected and coordinated, and then, secondly, proceed to carry out an operation on the basis of the selfsame intelligence they have collected and assessed. The temptation to trim the intelligence or, at least, their assessment of it, to suit the operation is well nigh irresistible.

An excellent example of the tragic results that can result from the failure to separate the assessment of intelligence from operational activities was demonstrated at the Bay of Pigs 2½ years ago.

If one result was drawn, if one lesson was learned, from that affair, it was that the responsibility for intelligence collection and assessment must be separated from the responsibility for carrying out operational activities.

I remember being among the small group of public officials who publicly took a stand prior to the Bay of Pigs, warning that an invasion would be unlikely of success since the majority of the Cuban people at that time favored the regime, a conclusion derived from my own visit to Cuba following my election in 1960 and a conclusion which I announced publicly after my return. After the Bay of Pigs, a board was set up and the general impression was that there would be drastic overhauls in our Central Intelligence Agency, including a separation of responsibility between those who gather and assess intelligence as opposed to those who carry out operational activities.

In fact, not only does the centralization of responsibility for the gathering and assessment of intelligence and the carrying out of subsequent operations rest under the same roof here in Washington, but the chiefs of station in the field appear to be carrying on these dual and conflicting responsibilities.

In this connection, too, we all recall President Kennedy's instruction to our Government personnel abroad on May 29, 1961, when he said that only the American Ambassador should be responsible for all American Government activities abroad. The President instructed that each Ambassador be fully informed about the activities of all agencies of the American Government in the country to which he is assigned. Yet, I must say that the Ambassador who is both completely at ease and fully informed about all the activities conducted by American Government people in the area of his assignment and aware of all the messages home is indeed a rare bird.

I fully realize that the Central Intelligence Agency is in general run and manned by remarkably brilliant, dedicated, and responsible individuals and that it has scored many successes. I also realize that, being an intelligence organization, the Central Intelligence Agency is in the defenseless position of being attacked for its public failures but unable to discuss freely its successes.

The question where there is doubt in my mind is whether the total number of successes outweigh the total number of failures; whether our American national interest in totality has been helped or hampered by the Central Intelligence Agency. And, when this determination is made, I believe we must separate the intelligence and assessment functions from the operational functions.

My own personal view is that a complete, fair assessment would show that the United States would have, on balance, gained greatly as the result of its intelligence collection and assessment activities. But I also believe that, on balance, the U.S. national interest may well have lost more than it has gained from its CIA operational activities, particularly if one takes into account the lives and

the dollars that have been lost in the carrying out of these activities. And I believe that an objective appraisal will show that when decisions to carry out operational activities have gone sour, the reason for clouded judgments has simply been that the same group assesses the intelligence and then proceeds to carry out the operation.

Actually, in South Vietnam, where, as the public press has set forth, we have had an excellent and very able Central Intelligence Agency chief of station, we might find ourselves in a better position if there were a greater separation between collecting and assessing of intelligence on the one hand and the carrying out of the subsequent operations on the other. We might not then be playing quite the same role we now do where the United States is helping finance and arm the South Vietnam regime's special forces, which carry out the persecution, beating up, and abuse of political opponents. I do hope that, in order to improve our situation in South Vietnam and throughout the world, the administration will make more positive steps to separate the responsibilities for the gathering and assessment of intelligence from the carrying out of subsequent operational activities.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point a well thought-out editorial from Tuesday's Washington Post illustrating the necessity of such a separation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OUR MAN IN SAIGON

The recall of the CIA chief in South Vietnam should not be an occasion for recrimination. It should be an occasion for some useful reconsideration of the general role of an intelligence agency in foreign affairs. Ambassador Lodge is reportedly concerned about the prevailing arrangement that makes the CIA both an intelligence-gathering organization and an operational agency in the field. Mr. Lodge is not alone in his concern.

In theory, within the CIA, the intelligence and operational activities are kept separate. In practice, the two functions cannot be kept apart so easily; experience has shown that agency operatives in the field have a tendency to use intelligence to support a operational decision. The result, too often, is that Washington receives neither impartial intelligence nor benefits from operations based on a hard-headed perception of reality.

Clearly the CIA is at a disadvantage in any public debate of its activities. The agency cannot speak for itself. Success often goes unnoticed; failure just as often may lead to an exaggeration of the CIA's responsibility. This is the price that secrecy exacts. But public concern in the agency's performance is legitimate and should not be squatted with an attempt to smear or to impute the motives of any CIA official.

What is sorely needed is a thorough and fair overall study of the intelligence community. Such an inquiry ought to deal with rivalry between the CIA and the Defense Intelligence Agency. It ought to draw on experience in other countries where intelligence and operational activities are lodged with separate organizational entities. And Congress should take the initiative in launching such a study.

For too many years, Members of Congress have closed their eyes to the need for legis-

lative scrutiny into intelligence operations. Yet who else can do the job? The public lacks the facts; the administration has a record to defend; the Agency cannot be expected to study itself. Enough has come to light to justify an impartial inquiry, which might properly be conducted by a special legislative commission drawing on Members of both Chambers and upon private citizens of stature and experience.

If an investigation should discover no grounds for changing the present arrangement, public apprehension would be lessened. If an investigation should disclose need for basic changes, then the country might be saved from future embarrassment. In either case, the United States would be the gainer and Congress would have discharged a duty that it has been far too reluctant to perform.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for yielding, and recall to his mind that I was a cosponsor with him in the previous Congress of a resolution that would have gone far in this direction, establishing a joint committee for supervision of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I was pleased to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island. There are special problems regarding the Central Intelligence Agency. I join him in expressing the hope that the Agency itself may support changes such as he recommends, and that the administration may respond not only to the criticisms about the Central Intelligence Agency and some of the more or less obvious indications of its operational failures, but what I think are some of the inadequacies of the whole structure of intelligence gathering and intelligence interpretation, and determine its action based on such information and interpretations.

If such action is not forthcoming from the Agency and such support is not forthcoming from the executive branch of the Government, Congress should move on its own initiative to try to improve the general operations of the Agency.

REDUCTION OF EXCESS MARKETINGS OF MILK

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1915) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and to encourage the reduction of excess marketings of milk, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, at the proper time tomorrow, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] I shall call up an amendment to the pending legislation, Amendment No. 193.

There is widespread unrest and uneasiness and concern among dairy farmers. In my opinion such concern on the part of dairy farmers is wholly justified. They find themselves in an economic situation which continues to grow more and more distressing. Dairy farmers are not receiving the benefits or returns from their work which are justified. Nor are they receiving the benefits of the Government program which was de-

signed to insure at least a reasonable return to them for what they contribute to the general economy and general welfare.

There is little hope for improvement in this situation unless Congress takes steps to reduce the surplus which depresses the dairy market and takes some steps to insure that dairy farmers will receive something approaching a fair return, or at least a fairer return, in the way of payment for that which they produce.

The legislation being sponsored today by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] takes one very limited step toward that objective, but, in my judgment, it falls far short of what is needed.

Of the major farm commodities which are under mandatory price supports, only the dairy industry shows a decline in the support prices received today as compared to 3 years ago.

In 1960, the average support price for wheat was \$1.78 a bushel. In 1963, the average support price was \$2.

In the case of corn, in 1960 it was \$1.06 a bushel. In 1963 it is \$1.25 a bushel.

In the case of cotton, the price per pound for upland, middling one-inch, was \$0.3242 in 1960. In 1963, it is \$0.3247.

In the case of peanuts, the 1960 average price support was \$0.1006. It is \$0.112 in 1963.

In the case of rice, it was \$4.42 in 1960. In 1963, it is \$4.71.

In the case of Blue-cured (11-14) tobacco, it was \$0.555 in 1960. In 1963 it is \$0.566.

In the case of milk for manufacturing purposes, the average support price in 1960 per hundred pounds was \$3.22. In 1963 it is down to \$3.14.

In my opinion, the producers of nearly all farm commodities deserve a higher income and a better price for their commodities. But it is clear from the comparative position of dairy price supports and dairy income that dairy farmers have more reason for dissatisfaction and greater need for remedial legislation—and that Congress, therefore, has a greater responsibility in this area.

The proposed legislation should be considered not only as dealing with the dairy industry, but also against the whole broad background in our approach to what is called the "farm problem."

Some commentators through the years have referred to what they call the farm bloc, and in recent months have observed that the farm bloc is "gone" or has disintegrated. I believe it is misleading to refer to a farm bloc, since there is no such organized bloc in Congress.

Of course, Members of Congress have a particular concern and a particular responsibility for farmers who produce specific crops in their districts or States.

However, the record of Congress over the past 25 years shows that many important pieces of farm legislation were enacted with the active support of Members of Congress from urban districts and urban States. In other words, farm legislation was not "put over" by adding up a farm bloc of sufficient votes to pass its legislation, or placed on the statute books by a kind of log-rolling operation.

Rather, it was in response to recognition by a majority of the Members of Congress of a justification and a need for this type of legislation, even though it applied primarily to the agricultural sector of our economy and to farmers.

There have been some partisan differences, of course, with respect to the correct approach to farm legislation. However, this is true with respect to almost every issue that comes before Congress. We should not enact legislation on a "bloc" basis. Congress should take problems as they come and review them and determine whether legislation is needed. The judgment should be based ultimately on whether legislation is in the national interest, and what is demanded by justice. If we were to act only when the States represented by a majority of the Members of Congress were directly benefited, much of the legislation in the way of development of water resources, and of other important conservation undertakings, which characterized the last 50 years of our history, would never have been initiated.

It is said that many Members of Congress are now indifferent to farmers and farm problems, particularly since the wheat program was rejected. I do not know whether it is true. Perhaps action on the pending dairy program may afford the first real test. Certainly I hope it is not true because the problems and difficulties of dairy farmers are serious and need attention.

The dairy program is not the same as the wheat program. Each must be dealt with separately. Each represents a particular approach to a specific problem.

In the case of the dairy industry, we are faced with the problem of continuing surpluses. The dominant influence upon the dairy industry and upon dairy prices today is the tremendous surplus of dairy products, for which there is no ready market. It acts to drive prices down toward the minimum support level, which currently is \$3.14 per hundred-weight for manufacturing milk. The surplus is so great that last year it cost the Government nearly \$500 million to maintain prices even at this near substandard or subsistence level.

In the last marketing year, the surplus of milk was 8.9 billion pounds of the 118 billion pounds marketed, or about 7.5 percent.

In April 1962, the price support level dropped to the minimum of 75 percent of parity set by law, from \$3.40 per hundred to \$3.11. It was predicted by some a year ago that the surplus problem would take care of itself because the 30-cent drop in support price would discourage production.

At best, that was a theory. Even if it were sound as a theory, it would be a questionable way to bring about adjustment in the production of milk. It shows little concern for the welfare of thousands of dairy farmers who individually have no way of bringing supplies in line with demand. It would represent a kind of squeeze-out theory for bringing about an adjustment in American agriculture.

In any case, this approach has failed, as many who discussed it at the time said it would fail. Despite bad weather

17958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 8

Another good sign of the economic vitality of El Salvador is the increasing amount of outside private capital being invested in the country. A combination of Esso and Shell already has an investment of more than \$10 million; Phelps Dodge is building a \$2 million copper and aluminum wire and cable plant. The Phillips Co. of the Netherlands is constructing a \$600,000 electric light bulb and appliance plant. Italian and U.S. interests are establishing a \$300,000 pencil and office supply plant.

Under the able hand of President Julio Rivera, and with the cooperation of Alliance for Progress officials, El Salvador is demonstrating to Latin America and to the world the effectiveness of the Alliance for Progress. El Salvador is not the only Alliance success story. Venezuela, Mexico, Argentina, Colombia—are all moving ahead of the anticipated schedule for the Alliance for Progress.

In El Salvador, as in many other parts of Latin America, the desired progress is being achieved through peaceful and creative evolution—an evolution more rapid, more comprehensive, and touching the lives of more people, than any that our history has ever known.

ESTABLISHING JOINT COMMITTEE TO SUPERVISE INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

(Mrs. KELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is most unfortunate that, for the past few weeks, there is evidence of misunderstanding in our military operations and military objectives, including our Central Intelligence Agency. Mr. Speaker, I feel there is no need to enlarge on this subject, but to state the fact that back in 1952, I foresaw the need to establish a joint committee of Congress to supervise all intelligence activities. I sought the advice of the late Senator McMahon, of Connecticut, who had so ably worked and helped to establish the great Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. He gave me much good advice and I sought also the advice of many lawyers who assisted in writing a resolution which was introduced by me on July 20, 1953, and was numbered House Concurrent Resolution 168. I continued to press for the adoption of this resolution in each succeeding Congress. This same resolution was numbered House Concurrent Resolution 29 in the 84th Congress; House Concurrent Resolution 3 in the 85th Congress; House Concurrent Resolution 3 in the 86th Congress; House Concurrent Resolution 3 in the 87th Congress; and House Concurrent Resolution 3 in the 88th Congress. While I do not believe in the numbers, Mr. Speaker, I do believe that "three and out" is a good omen. Let us "out" with this resolution in the Rules Committee, and pass it on the floor.

Congressman ZABLOCKI also introduced this resolution, as did Congressman JUDD. It was over a year before any other Member of the House introduced a similar resolution and it was after much urging

that Members of the other body followed our advice. The history surrounding this joint resolution is well established in the archives of Congress, but I regret to say, Mr. Speaker, that I firmly believe that, had this joint committee been established in the past, many of the problems involving U.S. intelligence would not be in the forefront of world news today. I therefore urge that the Members of Congress look into the need for such a resolution, sponsor one, and urge action by the present Congress.

To give a brief background on the story on this subject, I will insert again a statement I made in the past.

STATEMENT BY HON. EDNA F. KELLY, IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 3 TO ESTABLISH A JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE MATTERS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 1, 1961

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of this committee. I am grateful to the committee for its invitation to appear here today and give testimony in support of House Concurrent Resolution 3 which I introduced.

Perhaps it is somewhat appropriate that this matter was originally scheduled for hearing before this committee on the anniversary of the birthday of our first President. This coincidence prompts me to look back to the principle upon which our country was founded and upon which our Constitution is based. I, therefore, urge each of the members of the committee, bear in mind when considering my resolution, the constitutional system of checks and balances between the executive and legislative branches of this Government.

While hindsight is infinitely clearer than foresight, when discussing House Concurrent Resolution 3, I cannot help but reflect and think that had this resolution been adopted 8 years ago, when I first introduced it in the 83d Congress, many unfortunate incidents involving the security and prestige of the United States might have been avoided.

I cannot emphasize too strongly, however, the continuing need for the establishment of a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence Matters. With the high degree of world tensions, with the farflung scope of our foreign policy and other activities, when a single miscalculation may bring disaster, such a committee, as an arm of the Congress, is urgently required. The resolution calls for a continuing study, by such committee, of our Government's intelligence activities "and problems relating to the gathering of intelligence affecting the national security and of its coordination and utilization by the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government."

As you know under the present system, the Central Intelligence Agency, which was created in 1947 is responsible only to the National Security Council. There is no supervision or control by the legislative branch. The extent of its independence is demonstrated by the lack of review of the agency's expenditures by the Congress. In short, CIA makes its own policy and procedures, spends as much money as it may require, reviews its own errors if its conscience so dictates, and selects such remedies as it deems proper to correct its errors and to improve its operations. In this system the errors are never admitted while others which must be or are obvious may, after proper preparation, be presented as premature or unexpected.

While the need for secrecy in our intelligence activities is obvious, I feel, as many of my colleagues, that until a Joint Committee on Intelligence is created, there will be no way of determining what defects in the CIA

may be covered by the veil of secrecy with which it is shrouded. Our success with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy certainly justifies the present undertaking.

Lest the committee or the public consider this proposal to be quickly conceived or inspired by the recent U-2 incident, I consider it important to explore the background of this resolution.

Late in 1950, while serving on the committee which was responsible for the enactment of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (Battle Act), I came to realize the tremendous lack of knowledge, on the part of the Congress, on intelligence matters. After 2 years of periodic consultations with Members of the House, Members of the other body, and legal counsel, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 168 in the 83d Congress. While I endeavored to convince many other Members of the House to cosponsor my resolution, my success was limited to my distinguished colleagues Mr. Zablocki (H. Con. Res. 169, 83d Cong.) and Mr. Judd (H. Con. Res. 170, 83d Cong.).

Thereafter, I continued to press for the adoption of this resolution in each succeeding Congress (84th Cong., H. Con. Res. 29; 85th Cong., H. Con. Res. 3; 86th Cong., H. Con. Res. 3; 87th Cong., H. Con. Res. 3). As time passed, other of my colleagues either introduced similar resolutions or voiced their approval.

In 1954 a similar proposal was introduced in the other body. In 1955 this committee held hearings on this same resolution and referred the matter to a subcommittee for study. Thereafter, no additional hearing was held but no further action was taken.

During the 84th Congress, the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration considered a similar resolution sponsored by 36 Members of the Senate and reported it favorably. (S. Rept. 1570 84th Cong., 2d sess.). In its report the committee included several germane comments on the task force of the Second Hoover Commission.

The report stated:

"The task force is concerned over the absence of satisfactory machinery for surveillance of the stewardship of the CIA. It is making recommendations which it believes will provide the proper type of 'watchdog' commission as a means of reestablishing that relationship between the CIA and the Congress so essential and characteristic of our democratic form of government, but which was abrogated by the enactment of Public Law 110 and other statutes relating to the Agency. It would include Representatives of both Houses of Congress and of the Chief Executive. Its duties would embrace a review of the operations and effectiveness, not only of the CIA, but also of all other intelligence agencies."

The report continued:

"Although the task force has discovered no indication of abuses of powers by the CIA or other Intelligence Agencies, it nevertheless is firmly convinced, as a matter of future insurance, that some reliable, systematic review of all the agencies and their operations should be provided by congressional action as a checkrein to assure both the Congress and the people that this hub of the Intelligence effort is functioning in an efficient, effective, and reasonably economical manner."

The future insurance was not provided.

If it had, would we have been stabbed in the back by the shipment of arms by Russia to Egypt during the then pending 1955 Foreign Ministers Conference? Would we have been informed on the Hungarian Revolution; the downgrading of Stalin; Iraq; the sputniks and the Cuban situation? Because we lack information these questions must be left unanswered.

All of this does not mean that I want to see the Congress go into the intelligence business. What I desire is proper and legitimate

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

17957

of efficiency, you could do most of the work that the Navy is doing now in 2 or 3 yards, but it maintains a series of yards as standbys against an emergency. It has to have the private yards as standbys against emergency, too. Do you want to have the only know-how on building or repairing ships located in the naval shipyards, or do you want this spread throughout the economy so that in case of emergency you have this valuable asset to fall back on? I think that the division is a fair one. It protects both the Navy and encourages the private shipyards that are indispensable in time of war.

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain tabulations relating to the conference report and the amendments in disagreement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the motion which is pending is to recede and concur in the Senate position that in ship alteration, repair, and conversion the business of the Navy shall be distributed 65 percent to the public shipyards and 35 percent to the private shipyards. In my judgment this seems to be a reasonably satisfactory compromise. It is the language of the present law which was approved by Congress last year; it is the language which is contained in the President's budget; it is the language which is agreeable to the Secretary of Defense. I realize that there are many shades of feeling in regard to the situation. But in view of all the facts and circumstances, I trust that the House will approve the position of the conferees and agree to the motion which provides for 65-35 percent distribution of work in this field of Navy activity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

(Mr. FRASER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the recent military coups in the Dominican Republic and in Honduras are of grave concern to all Americans. Our Nation has a deep commitment to constitutional government not only because it raises and enhances the dignity and personal freedom of those citizens who enjoy its benefits, but also because it provides the means whereby change can come about in an orderly fashion. Our concern about the takeover by military juntas in these countries is not predicated upon approval of every action taken by the constitutionally elected leaders of those

countries—indeed, perhaps some programs and actions should have been undertaken in a different manner than they were. The true failure here, however, lies in the use of unconstitutional means to make a change instead of leaving this decision to the citizens of those countries expressed through a free ballot.

I address myself today, however, to the implications which these military coups may have for American foreign policy and our aid programs. Should we interpret these setbacks as evidence of failure of the Alliance for Progress? I think not. It is my judgment that these overthrows are clear evidence of the urgency of the need for an ever stronger effort through the Alliance for Progress.

We are engaged in a long-range war in this hemisphere to make freedom prevail over oppression; enlightenment over ignorance; and economic well-being over poverty. We will not win every battle, but we shall win the war through the combined efforts of the nations of this hemisphere joined in a common effort through the Alliance for Progress.

The 200 million people of Latin America are engaged in a gigantic revolution—the “revolution of rising expectations.” It is a peaceful revolt against injustice, poverty, malnutrition, disease, illiteracy, and appalling living conditions. In many countries more than half the people are undernourished and illiterate, and millions of children are denied an education because of the lack of schools and teachers.

The people of the hemisphere know that a better life is now possible. They want the material and social benefits enjoyed by the peoples of other nations in the 20th century, and they are impatient for change. They are determined that the decade of the sixties should become a decade of development.

The Alliance for Progress is a sustained cooperative effort, jointly planned through the Organization of American States and consisting of sound national programs for long-term economic and social development. The aim of the Alliance is, as President Kennedy declared:

The construction of a new community of American nations in which all our citizens can live not only free from fear but full of hope.

The Alliance has begun to lay solid foundations for progress. Latin Americans are beginning to build and own homes, send their children to new schools, receive previously unattainable medical attention, farm their own fields, gain jobs in new industries, travel over new roads, and join unions, credit institutions and cooperatives that aim to serve instead of exploit.

Thus, we must measure our setbacks in this hemisphere—hopefully only temporary—in the context of some of our gains. We are making gains.

El Salvador, for example, has become one of the shining lights in the Alliance for Progress.

Before the Alliance, El Salvador was a typical Central American Republic. Military governments, in cooperation

with the landed aristocracy, had kept the country in a semifeudal condition. Seventy-five families controlled 90 percent of the wealth, with the country's 2.7 million people working primarily on the large fincas of the great landlords.

El Salvador was one of the first Latin American nations to implement the Charter of Punta del Este, which established the Alliance for Progress. In early 1961, steps were taken to halt the flight of capital. A stabilization program was developed in cooperation with the International Monetary Fund in order to correct the balance-of-payments deficit and strengthen the country's currency. As a result of these controls, El Salvador now has a favorable balance of payments.

El Salvador continued its economic reform program by raising, in September 1961, the progressive income tax rates. These are now among the highest tax rates in the hemisphere. As a result, revenue receipts have increased over 40 percent. In 1 year governmental revenues were increased by \$10.5 million. Other tax reforms followed. Measures were taken to increase the amount of tax paid for consumption and luxury goods. Tax collecting procedures were simplified and improved.

Hand in hand with administrative reforms new planning machinery was established. A National Council of Economic Planning and Coordination, composed of El Salvador's leading economic specialists, was created to spur economic activity and prepare long-range program budgets.

Recognizing that economic development must be coordinated with social development to provide a balanced approach for the overall well-being of the people, Alliance for Progress officials in El Salvador also tackled the social problems of the country. In early 1962 an agency was created for providing supervised production credit to small farmers. In little more than a year, nearly 6,000 agricultural credit loans have been made. Seven health centers, to serve 150,000 people were constructed in 1962. In addition, a mobile rural health program was begun, designed to serve 300,000 persons a year.

The National Housing Agency of El Salvador has already constructed 1,500 home units since the start of the Alliance. Just recently a national homebuilding mortgage agency was created, modeled after our own FHA, for stimulating greater investment in housing. This is a major step forward in the housing field, which is generally recognized as one of the most important aspects of social reform.

Education now consumes 22 percent of the national budget. In October 1962, apprenticeship training legislation was enacted. By December, some 300 apprentices were registered in training. A domestic peace corps has been organized in El Salvador to perform adult education and community development work.

El Salvador's economic growth is now greatly improved. In 1962, for example, industrial production rose over 20 percent from the previous year.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

17059

congressional control over such activities. The Hoover Commission Task Force outlined the areas of congressional interest as follows:

1. Conduct comprehensive studies of foreign intelligence activities of the United States;
2. Look for overlapping and duplication;
3. Determine whether expenditures are within budget authorizations and in keeping with the expressed intent of Congress; and
4. Consider whether any of the activities are in conflict with the foreign policy aims and programs of the United States.

With these tools the Congress would reassume its constitutional authority and in no way jeopardize intelligence activities.

One of the principal arguments advanced against my resolution is that no other nation permits legislative control of its intelligence activities. Such system is practical for the Soviet dictatorship and even for Great Britain where the administration is a part of and responsible to Parliament. Under our Constitution, however, with delicate system of check and balances, dislocations as in the case of CIA cannot be tolerated.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I respectfully urge that this committee do favorably report House Concurrent Resolution 3 for action by the House.

SECURITY RISKS

(Mr. SNYDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, on 2 successive days last week articles appeared in Chicago's American newspaper in regard to the State Department's move to oust Otto Otepka, Chief of the Evaluation Division of the Department's Office of Security.

These articles follow:

[From Chicago's American, Oct. 2, 1963]

THE ALLEN-SCOTT REPORT: BITTER ROW ON SECURITY RISKS

WASHINGTON.—The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has pried open a real can of worms in its investigation of the State Department's move to discredit and oust Otto Otepka, 48, Chief of the Evaluation Division in the Department's Office of Security.

In digging into the Otepka case, the Senate probers have uncovered a backstage effort within the State Department to clear the way for a number of former security risks, including Alger Hiss, to worm their way back onto the Government's payroll as either employees or consultants.

According to the sworn testimony before the subcommittee, one of the central figures in this maneuvering is Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Affairs.

ADVISORY APPOINTMENTS

Cleveland touched off the bitter security row within the Department by appointing a number of persons with questionable security backgrounds to an advisory committee to study the staffing of Americans on international organizations.

According to the testimony, Cleveland also made inquiries as to whether it would be possible to bring Hiss, a former State Department official convicted of perjury to conceal espionage, back into the Department.

Otepka was so shocked over Cleveland's activities that he sent a series of blistering reports to his superiors, including one that was routed through channels to McGeorge Bundy, the President's Chief White House Adviser on Foreign Policy.

One of these reports included a detailed box score of persons with questionable security background whom Cleveland had either brought into the Department or was

in the process of trying to obtain job clearance for.

When the State Department's daisy chain tipped off Cleveland that he was being watched, he retaliated swiftly by having John F. Reilly, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Security, place Otepka under surveillance. This was arranged through the office of Attorney General Robert Kennedy, a personal friend of Reilly.

Otepka was then removed from security operations. His phone was bugged and he was placed under close observation after it was learned that Senate investigators had questioned him, under subpoena, about security risks in the Department.

Charges of misconduct, involving the alleged release of documents to the Senate Subcommittee, were filed against Otepka September 23 by John Ordway, Chief of the Personnel Operations Division.

According to the findings in a State Department investigative report, evidence was found that Otepka had furnished "a copy of classified memorandum concerning the processing of appointments of the advisory committee on international organization staffing to Mr. J. G. Sourwine, staff director of the Senate Subcommittee for Internal Security. This memorandum concerns the loyalty of employees or prospective employees of the Department within the meaning of the Presidential directives of March 13, 1948."

INFORMATION ON SECURITY RISKS

The report also charged that Otepka was responsible "for the declassification of a document containing classified information addressed to McGeorge Bundy, the White House, and signed by William H. Brubeck, Special Assistant Secretary and Executive Secretary of the Department." This document contained information about security risks within the Department.

Otepka, a civil service and State Department officer for more than 20 years, has one of the most outstanding records in his field of work in the Government. He was responsible for sending Irving C. Scarbeck, a Foreign Service Officer, to jail for passing U.S. secrets to the Russians, and for investigating William Wieland in connection with the State Department's Cuban policy. In all his investigations, the records show he has bent over backwards in protecting the rights of individuals under his surveillance. The Senate Subcommittee now plans to give Otepka the same protection.

[From Chicago's American, Oct. 3, 1963]

A PLOT TO BRING HISS BACK

We are almost beyond being surprised at any goings-on in the State Department, but we do find this one astonishing: There is a group in there that is working like mad to bring the convicted perjurer, Alger Hiss, back into the Department. And for this purpose, the group is trying to get one of the Department's chief security officers fired. The officer is Otto Otepka, Chief of the Evaluation Division. He is opposed to the return of Hiss and to the proposed hiring of several men of doubtful loyalty.

These strange facts were set out on our editorial page Wednesday in the Allen-Scott report, which said the revelations had been brought to light by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. A leader in the movement to get Otepka out of Hiss' way, according to testimony given to the Senate subcommittee, is Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Affairs. Cleveland, according to testimony given before the Senate subcommittee, has been asking how it might be possible to get Hiss back on the payroll.

Hiss, you will remember, was convicted (and served a prison term) on charges of having perjured himself to cover up the fact that, while serving as an official of the State Department, he supplied Russia with U.S.

secrets. If Cleveland wants Hiss back, then obviously Cleveland should not be in the American State Department.

The Senate subcommittee should bring all phases of this peculiar situation to the country's attention. And in the meanwhile, it should not permit the firing of Otepka for thinking and acting like a loyal American.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is imperative that the Department of State advise the country forthwith as to whether or not there is any truth in the allegation that they are working to bring Alger Hiss back into the State Department. All America will want to know whether or not the charges in the above articles are correct—and if so, it is time that the Congress do something about it. If the statements are not true, the Congress and the American people deserve to know the facts.

WHEAT SALE TO THE SOVIET UNION

(Mr. CHAMBERLAIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, last night's Washington Evening Star and this morning's New York Times carried stories saying that a wheat sale to the Soviet Union was all but concluded. I find this all a little astonishing and disturbing.

It is astonishing because the administration apparently after only a few days of trial balloons and calculated press releases, without any genuine public or congressional debate, is willing to do handstands to help relieve Khrushchev from the disastrous failures of Soviet agriculture. It is disturbing because nowhere have I found in the press reports a consistent statement of facts and figures that clearly spell out the factors that are involved in this deal. No one seems to know where this deal will lead. This fact raises a great many questions that must be settled before I, in my own mind, can support such a sale.

For instance, we are being told from many sides that the trade is in everybody's best interests—we dispose of our wheat surplus and get some needed gold and they get the wheat. But is it really that simple? Can we treat this trade deal as an isolated event in the cold war? Can we ignore the fact that the American people are spending more than \$55 billion this year to protect the free nations of the world from communistic aggression? Why are we so eager to get a paltry \$200 to \$300 million when we are at the same time spending 250 times that much to prevent the expansion of communism? Why is the administration in such a hurry to conclude this deal?

As I understand the Latta amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1951, it declared the policy of Congress to be against the export or sale of any subsidized agricultural commodity to any nation that is not considered to be friendly. In the face of this clear and unmistakable pronouncement of congressional policy, it would seem that the President would undertake to consult officially with the Congress before con-

17960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 8

sidering any transaction such as has been reported in the press. It seems imperative to me that under the circumstances, Congress should be consulted on such a basic and far-reaching change of policy.

Another question: So we sell \$250 million worth of wheat to the Soviets. That would really only represent a small dent in our surplus of over \$3½ billion. So we make a few fast gold bricks. Is it worth it? The consequences of this trade deal will not end when the wheat-laden ships leave our harbors. We will have taken Khrushchev off the hook at home and he will be able to say to the Soviet people, "Look what I've done. I've gotten our capitalistic enemies to subsidize communism." No one could help but applaud such an astute leader.

How can we ever again ask the free nations of the world not to trade with communistic nations?

There is much about this whole transaction to be thoroughly explored. It should be done deliberately. We should not act in haste. We should not impulsively turn to a new form of dollar diplomacy devoid of other considerations. The President should make known all of his reasons for such a deal and let the American people and the Congress evaluate them. The quick shuffle that we are getting causes me to be suspicious. We must not be too anxious for a few pieces of silver or gold.

Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I am including a sampling of letters received from residents of Michigan's Sixth Congressional District with respect to this proposed transaction:

LANSING, MICH.,
October 2, 1963.

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Your last report (Sept. 30) did not contain anything about the administration's proposal to sell surplus wheat to the U.S.S.R., but when it was composed maybe the matter did not seem so possible.

There are many things in our Government that may be the discretion of the Executive Department and the Cabinet officers reporting to it, but is there no way that the ordinary citizen who tries to think the problems of our country through can express indignation at the inconsistency (ies) of the foreign policy? (except I mean by writing you). Why cannot we, the people, vote on selling vital supplies to our enemies?

I hope I am not inhuman and un-Christian in rebelling against such a proposal. I don't want anyone to go hungry—but when someone threatens to bury you (and Mr. K's threat was not an idle one) is it sensible or commercially wise to buy some of the spades, shovels and bulldozers for him? I would be willing to help pay the sums that will compose the profit or price of such sale if the commodity was kept from Russian life in even the same fashion that pigs and wheat were destroyed 30 years ago with less purpose.

Perhaps, everyone who agrees with me will not take the time to write you about their resentment of such folly on the part of the weather-vane foreign policymakers, but considering there was no use to write Michigan Senators my opinion of the treaty because of their committed prejudgment, I couldn't let this opportunity pass to condemn such bad business and lack of patriotism.

Most sincerely,

FLINT, MICH.,
October 2, 1963.

DEAR SIR: I was reading the newspaper this evening. In it was a item saying that this country may sell wheat to the Russians, if our President approves. Well sir, I can tell you now it made me pretty damn mad to think that the leaders of this country would even think of doing a thing like that.

Here we are with a national debt so high and our leaders in Washington asking for more. But the thing that tops it off is, the money they say is necessary to protect us from the very people we are going to sell wheat to.

As I have been reading about our past relations with Russia, I keep seeing where we have pulled their "chestnuts out of the fire", before. In fact it seems we have pulled a lot of "chestnuts out of the fire", for friends and foes alike, and our friends have turned out to be not so friendly either. I hope maybe we will wake up some day to the facts of life and get a little tougher. But if not that, lets get a little more for our money.

I cannot cite all of the figures, but I am sure you know them quite well. The figures I am referring to are: what it costs to maintain our defenses, also what it cost to support our so-called friends. If you add them all up, it would come to a pretty neat sum. Yet. There are leaders in this country jumping like a lot of fish out of water for a chance to help the Russians. Who by the way are the one's who said "We will bury you." They forgot to add that we will help them dig the hole.

The argument goes like this, for selling wheat to the Russians. "If we don't sell it to them some one else will." Well let me tell you something. The only ones in position to sell to them are our so-called friends. So I say, let them sell to the Russians. It will show who will sell us out for a better deal. As you have gathered by now I am against this deal. I am a disabled veteran and I add this only because I want you to know that our country had a little pride once.

Thank you.

BRIGHTON, MICH.,
October 2, 1963.

Representative CHARLES CHAMBERLAIN,
Lansing, Mich.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you in regard to the sale of wheat to Russia.

My husband and I are against this sale of wheat to Russia or any other communistic country.

We pretend to fight communism, yet here we are in the act of feeding it.

I remember a few years ago we sold scrap iron to a country and how did it come back. This is the same thing. We will be nourishing it. I feel that President Kennedy has let the American people down by this approval of wheat being sent to Russia.

Thanking you for your kind attention to past correspondence, I am

Yours truly,

U.S. POLICY AIMS IN LATIN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the rush of recent events makes necessary some restatement of basic U.S. policy aims in Latin America. In this regard, I commend Assistant Secretary of State Martin for his forthright and realistic statement of last Saturday relating to what this country can and should do about government upheavals in the hemisphere.

There is no question but that the best interest of the United States lies in the existence of a democratic and economically stable Latin America. Thus, our purpose in the area is to create an atmosphere in which democracy and economic stability can flourish.

But as Assistant Secretary Martin rightly points out, democracy is "a living thing which must have time and soil and sunlight in which to grow."

"We must do all we can to create these favorable conditions," Mr. Martin says, "and we can do and have done much." However, he continues, "we cannot simply create the plant and give it to them; it must spring from seeds planted in an indigenous soil."

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I have often criticized past State Department attitudes and actions which I believe were not in the best interests of our country. However, Mr. Martin's incisive analysis of our Nation's responsibility and capability in dealing with Latin American coups and government upheavals deserves special praise, coming as it does when a confused clamor is heard to enforce democracy-by-gunboat in the Dominican Republic and Honduras.

We may hope that Mr. Martin's words are now to be followed by action supporting his thesis that we should not adversely judge the new regimes in these countries until additional evidence is in regarding their composition and intentions.

Confused indeed is the chorus that calls for immediate action, drastic action, even direct military action by this country to restore the Juan Bosch and Villeda Morales governments to power. Many of these voices are the same ones who so often in the past have been cautioning against any effective action directed against the Soviet satellite, Cuba. Where now are their arguments concerning the U.S. need to recognize the fact that it cannot enforce its will on the hemisphere? Where now the admonitions concerning the effect on world opinion if the United States intervenes in the domestic affairs of smaller countries? Where now the counsel of inaction and patience, the talk of "complexities" and the warnings against "oversimplifications" whenever steps are urged to meet the very real threat of Castro's Cuba to the hemisphere?

Gunboat diplomacy—is that not the very course which some now urge this country to pursue in the Dominican Republic and Honduras? But why, we may ask, do some of these same observers of the Latin American scene take an ambivalent position regarding undemocratic regimes of the left and the right? If these observers can be patient about Castro's Cuba, its undemocratic and totalitarian rule over the Cuban people, its role as a Soviet satellite increasing tensions throughout the hemisphere, and its service as a base for military and subversive operations against hemispheric security—why then impatiently urge the administration to call out the marines to intervene in the Dominican Republic and Honduras?

Surely these observers cannot seriously believe that the military juntas of the

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of approximately five million eight hundred thousand pounds of waterfowl feathers and down now held in the national stockpile. Such disposal may be made without regard to the requirement of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b (e)), that no such disposition shall be made until six months after publication in the Federal Register and transmission to the Congress and to the Armed Services Committees thereof of a notice of the proposed disposition.

THE TASK OF PREPARING AN ADVISORY REPORT ON THE STEPS WHICH MIGHT BE TAKEN TO REDUCE THE BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS DEFICIT

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, you will recall that I called the attention of the House on Tuesday to the action by the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, in assigning to me and two of my colleagues, Representatives R. T. HANNA, Democrat, of California, and WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey, the task of preparing an advisory report on the steps which might be taken to reduce the balance-of-payments deficit.

My colleagues in the House are all familiar, I am sure, with the message of President Kennedy on July 18, with specific reference to our balance-of-payments problem but because of the detail of his excellent and exhaustive message, I believe that one significant paragraph should be emphasized in pointing to the need for a special study with regard to the imbalance of tourist circulation here and abroad as it affects the overall picture.

The President said:

Another element that requires attention in our commercial transactions is the increase in our unfavorable net tourist balance. With increasing prosperity encouraging American travel abroad, total tourist spending in foreign countries rose another 10 percent last year, to nearly $2\frac{1}{2}$ billion. This was partially offset by increased foreign tourist expenditures in the United States, but the net result was an outflow of \$1.4 billion, or two-thirds of last year's overall balance-of-payments deficit. This year the cost is estimated to be still greater.

I am sure, in view of the foregoing remarks by Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Patman showed great wisdom in deciding to have this aspect thoroughly explored.

I should like, also, to call attention of the House to a letter I received today from Mr. Volt Gilmore, Director of the U.S. Travel Service of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

Mr. Gilmore, a dedicated public servant, has done an outstanding job with limited resources in our efforts to generate more European tourist traffic to the United States which is so helpful in holding down this balance-of-payments deficit. I am sure the situation would be much more serious than that related by the President had it not been for the wise move by the Congress in creating the U.S. Travel Service.

Mr. Gilmore wrote me:

We believe it is important that your study identify and highlight the relationship of the "tourist dollar gap" in our balance-of-payments situation to the total U.S. balance-of-payments position. Your subcommittee would wish to give careful attention to the fact that U.S. tourist dollars spent abroad help many other countries purchase more U.S. goods and services than we purchase from them.

In studying ways to improve our travel balance-of-payments position, we believe you will find two major areas of emphasis: the "Visit USA" campaign abroad to attract foreign visitors to the United States, and the "See America" campaign aimed at U.S. citizens which is to be energized in 1964. An important distinction exists between the two. Through the U.S. Travel Service, our Government is effectively encouraging foreign travel to the United States with a program that is understood and approved by other governments. The "See America" campaign would logically be mounted by private enterprise, not by Government, because it could not only be disadvantageous to many U.S. organizations engaged in international travel, but also resented by other governments (particularly near neighbors such as Canada and Mexico) as a "don't go abroad" policy. However, substantial encouragement can be given to the American travel industry to enlarge and improve its tourist plant, thus enhancing U.S. travel destinations for U.S. and foreign visitors.

We are at the complete disposal of your subcommittee for such assistance as you would find helpful and we wish you every success in your study.

NEED FOR A CONGRESSIONAL WATCHDOG COMMITTEE OVER THE CIA

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have long been concerned over the way the CIA has carried on its clandestine activities in an uncontrolled and unrestricted manner. For our primary intelligence community to be appropriated funds and design its own course of direction without the benefit of close congressional scrutiny is not only unwise, but also an injustice to the American citizens whom we are sworn to represent.

We need a joint congressional watchdog committee over the CIA. The only argument against such a committee is the trite argument that the Congress cannot keep a secret and this has been disproved by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The Bay of Pigs fiasco in Cuba as well as recent developments in South Vietnam clearly show that the CIA and our other intelligence agencies need careful watching and evaluating by the Congress.

The CIA's apparent mistaken role of policymaker in the South Vietnam situation has backfired, and reports advise that the head of operations has been recalled by the U.S. Government. It is the role of the President of the United States to formulate the foreign policy of the United States; not the CIA. The function of the CIA is to gather information, and in some cases interpret it. To go further into the area of policymaking is unpermissible.

An editorial in Sunday's edition of the New York Times calls attention to the problem of the CIA in the area of policymaking and calls for a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence. It is encouraging to notice that more and more the newspapers of this country in their news reports on the conditions in South Vietnam are showing their concern along with Congress over the unbridled activities of the CIA. I have urged the Congress since January to adopt my bill, House Joint Resolution 211, which provides for the establishment of a joint congressional watchdog committee over the CIA and our other intelligence agencies. I feel that history has proved the need for such a committee, and I hope that the United States does not have to be rudely awakened again by another Bay of Pigs or a South Vietnam hassle before it acts.

I would like to insert at this point in the Record the New York Times' editorial from Sunday's edition that I mentioned above:

STATE WITHIN A STATE

Is the Central Intelligence Agency a state within a state?

President Kennedy's recall of the head of CIA operations in South Vietnam, coming after persistent reports of discord between him and Ambassador Lodge, appears to provide substantive corroboration to the long-voiced charges that our intelligence organization too often tends to make policy.

The CIA is a large and, on the whole, well-organized intelligence apparatus, which knows and employs all the tricks of the trade. But it not only gathers intelligence, it "operates" saboteurs, guerrillas and other paramilitary forces. And its operations—particularly if they are not carefully programmed, controlled, and directed—tend wilfully to influence policy, if not to make it.

The Agency has many extremely able men. But it operates behind the cloak of anonymity and secrecy—and secrecy adds to power. When the same organization collects intelligence and evaluates it, and, at the same time, conducts clandestine operations—and when that organization is as powerful and as well financed as the CIA—there is an inevitable tendency for some of its personnel to assume the functions of kingsmakers.

Communist imperialism and the exigencies of the nuclear age have brought us sons away—whether we like it or not—from the era of 1929, when Secretary of State Stimson closed the Nation's only code-breaking organization with the remark that "gentlemen do not read each other's mail." Today we must read the other fellow's mail if we want to survive.

But the CIA, like the FBI, has gone too long without adequate congressional accountability. A Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence, so long urged but so often frustrated by congressional pride of place and petty jealousies, should be established to monitor our intelligence services, to safeguard their security and to reduce the dangers secret espionage and covert operations present to a free society.

17926

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 7

THE TITO VISIT

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of next week, the White House plans to welcome Dictator Tito of Yugoslavia. I wish to register my opposition to the visit of this missionary of communism.

Frankly, I am at a loss to understand why the President invited Tito to stop in Washington for an informal visit. Surely, the meeting of this assassin with our head of state can only be called a betrayal of freedom's interests.

The United States has nothing to gain from such a visit and a lot to lose. Already we can detect indications of resentment from those in Eastern Europe who are painfully aware of Tito's long record of brutality.

Ask yourself how you would react if you were one of the millions of people enslaved by world communism and saw a picture of President Kennedy shaking hands with Tito on the steps of the White House. Would it be any less revolting than the news photographs published recently of Tito, who has been given \$2.5 billion in U.S. aid, and Khrushchev embracing each other when the Kremlin chief spent 15 days in Yugoslavia? This was the occasion when these two Reds told an international news conference that they represented and would work for the same thing: a worldwide victory for socialism.

How can we expect the world to seriously believe that the United States is committed to an all-out effort to defeat Communists when a gangster like Tito is invited to visit the President of the United States? Tito is a Communist dictator who seized Yugoslavia and for years carried on a savage campaign against those who opposed him. Let us never forget that if the United States has to go to war to protect liberty, justice, and religion from the onslaught of communism, Tito and his nation will be on the other side.

I am afraid that the current euphoria over the possibilities for relaxed tensions between the free world and the Communist bloc are lulling us to sleep. Despite the test ban treaty, the proposed sale of wheat to Russia, the toned-down speeches of Russian leaders, there has been no change in the avowed intention of Moscow or Peiping to communize the entire world. I pray there never will be cause for a future author to write "Why America Slept."

Perhaps, we are too far removed from "the scene of the crime" to recognize Tito for what he is. But the Serbian emigrants from Yugoslavia and the people there today know what kind of man Tito is. They shall not forget how he snatched power with the support of Soviet bayonets; how he never has given the people the right of free elections, a free press, or free meetings; how he has killed or oppressed all the proponents of democracy, beginning with Gen. Draza Mihailovic; how he has imprisoned without judge or court more than

7 million voters only because they were for real democracy.

It is regrettable that the past visits to our country by other foes of the United States have not convinced this administration of the sorry consequences which usually follow. With President Kennedy's good-byes still ringing in his ears, Algerian ruler Ben Bella met with Fidel Castro and pledged his undying devotion to Red Cuba's anti-U.S. policy. British Guiana's Cheddi Jagan accepted our hospitality and then denounced us the moment he arrived home. Now he is working on a deal with Moscow to establish a Cuba-style regime. Ayub of Pakistan received lavish White House treatment, but now we are using our foreign aid in an attempt to keep him from the friendly arms of Communist China.

Mr. Speaker, Tito should not be welcomed by this country. I believe the President has made a big mistake in issuing the invitation to him.

STRIKES HURT AMERICAN
MERCHANT MARINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BONNER) is recognized for 20 minutes.

(Mr. BONNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House the plight of the American merchant marine. It is with deep regret, distress and a sense of frustration that I point out and call to the attention of the House the unusual situation that exists with reference to the ship, the SS *America*. The American merchant marine has received another setback in this instance with the cancellation of the October 4 sailing of one of the finest transatlantic passenger ships. A similar event occurred on September 14 when the SS *America's* voyage was canceled following a labor dispute in which the unlicensed crewmembers walked off the ship making such charges against an engineering officer as, being guilty of religious and racial bias, and the locking of a toilet so that unlicensed crewmembers could not use it.

As a result of this cancellation, 945 passengers already aboard the ship had to either give up their plans to sail to Europe or find alternate means of transportation.

Some 950 passengers were booked for the return voyage.

The October 4 sailing had been booked by 640 passengers sailing from New York, and another 895 on the return voyage from European ports.

Since that time the United States Lines has announced that three cruises of the S. S. *America* have been canceled. The United States Lines applied to the Maritime Administrator for permission to cancel the balance of the schedule for the year, but the administration at this time ruled that at least 2 of the 3 remaining transatlantic sailings must be made.

At the same time there are rumors in the trade that this overage vessel may

never sail again, thus reducing the number of jobs available to our merchant seamen.

Scarcely more than a week earlier than the first cancellation, Mr. Joseph Curran, president of the unlicensed seamen's National Maritime Union, proudly announced the reaching of an agreement with passenger and freighter operators which would extend the existing contract from 1965 to 1969. In a report to the union membership Mr. Curran said:

Your union proposed this long-term contract extension to the shipowners. They wanted stability in the industry so they could make long-range plans to expand their operations and build their fleets. NMU wants that kind of stability too. It will benefit our members and the merchant marine.

After the September 14 walkout the union and the United States Lines Co. submitted the dispute to arbitration, in accordance with the procedure under their contract, but not in time to permit the September sailing to proceed. Now the October sailing is held up even after the arbitrator's ruling that the men should return to work because the indications are that further controversy with the engineers' union will develop.

Mr. Speaker, we have had many months of hearings in the Merchant Marine Committee on maritime labor-management problems. All of the labor leaders and some management officials have told us that there is no situation in which labor and management cannot resolve differences without third party intervention.

Mr. Speaker, while I would not attempt to contend that the cancellation of three sailings of the S.S. *America* creates a national emergency, I must say that I feel that these recent incidents demonstrate very vividly the helplessness of the public as innocent victims of selfish and even childish fighting, with reckless disregard of the responsibilities that both the union leaders and their members should bear.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I refer not only to this incident but the previous situation just a short while ago when we had the whole Atlantic and gulf seaboard tied up. This paralyzed not only passenger and freight vessels of this Nation but cargo vessels and vessels of other nations. The docks on the Atlantic and gulf seaboard were piled high with cargo inbound and outbound. It cost this country millions and millions of dollars and emphasized the undependability of American flag lines. During that controversy the hearings which I have spoken of on the bill H.R. 1897 were proceeding in the House.

During the hearings the gentleman who controls the longshoremen on the Pacific coast testified that if the Atlantic coast, the South Atlantic coast and the gulf port stevedores requested it, he would have locked up the Pacific coast notwithstanding a valid and subsisting contract to work. And you would have had this Nation locked up—lock, stock and barrel—in its commerce, and everything else in the Nation would have had to stop operations in a comparatively

STAT

Approved For Release 2005/06/06 : CIA-RDP71B00364R000600100006-5

Approved For Release 2005/06/06 : CIA-RDP71B00364R000600100006-5

UPI-83

(CIA)

WASHINGTON--TWO SENATORS CALLED AGAIN TODAY FOR CREATION OF A CONGRESSIONAL WATCHDOG COMMITTEE TO KEEP TAB ON WHAT HE CALLED THE "UNCHECKED POWERS" OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY (CIA).

SEN. ERNEST GRUNING, D-ALASKA, TOLD THE SENATE HE WILL OFFER AN AMENDMENT TO CREATE SUCH A COMMITTEE, LONG ADVOCATED BY A MEMBER OF LAWMAKERS. SEN. WAYNE MORSE, D-ORE., SAID HE AGREED AND SAID "THE ALTERNATIVE IS THE DEVELOPMENT OF A CREEPING POLICE STATE IN THE UNITED STATES."

MORSE SAID: "THIS IS A CANCER THAT MUST BE REMOVED."

GRUNING, WHO READ INTO THE RECORD A NEW YORK TIMES EDITORIAL ON THE ISSUE, SAID THE CIA HAS "GONE TOO LONG" WITHOUT REAL CONGRESSIONAL SUPERVISION. MORSE SAID SOME PEOPLE HAVE "ALIBIED IN THE PAST" THAT THE CIA IS ADEQUATELY WATCHED BY THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE. BUT HE SAID SOME APPROPRIATIONS MEMBERS REPLY THAT "THIS NO CHECK AT ALL."

THE OREGONIAN SAID A WATCHDOG COMMITTEE SHOULD BE ABLE TO "REQUEST EVERY BIT OF INTELLIGENCE INFORMATION IT THINKS IT OUGHT TO HAVE" FROM THE CIA.

10/7--AM1238PED

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17789

I have mentioned and begin to try to devise some method which would make the Government supreme and enable the American public, which must pay the tax bill, to be recognized in their dignity and their just position in this dispute. I yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Delaware on the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 5 minutes.

ALLEGED HIDDEN MICROPHONE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in yesterday's Washington Post there appeared a certain article. I should like to read two paragraphs from that article:

WILLIAMS began his informal one-man inquiry last week by calling into his office at least three persons who allegedly have had close commercial dealings with Baker recently.

The interviews, it was learned, lasted from a half hour to an hour and the Senator had a secretary taking notes in an adjoining room equipped with a direct microphone arrangement into his office.

I quote again the last part of that statement:

The Senator had a secretary taking notes in an adjoining room with a direct microphone arrangement into his office.

Mr. President, there is no basis for that statement. The reporter who wrote it did not talk with me or with anyone in my office that I know of. I know he did not talk with me. I have been a Member of the Senate for 17 years, and there has never been a hidden microphone in my office and never will be as long as I am in the Senate. Anyone who has ever visited my office and wished to discuss any matter has discussed it with me in strict confidence, as intended, and if I wanted any notes taken, a secretary would be called into the office with the knowledge of the visitor, and he would be sitting in the secretary's presence.

I do not know why this story was put into the newspaper in that manner—whether it was merely an irresponsible piece of reporting or whether it was to frighten away somebody who might wish to come to my office and talk over some matter. I wish to make sure it does not serve its purpose. I emphatically deny that there is any truth whatsoever to it. Furthermore, the reporter who wrote it knows it is untrue.

I regret that such a report was ever made, however, since it has been made I want to set the record straight.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time which is under the control of the majority leader be under the control of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Commerce, who is in charge of the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President—The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has control of the time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield such time as the Senator wishes.

Mr. GRUENING. Five minutes will be sufficient.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alaska is recognized for 5 minutes.

SENATE SHOULD PASS SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 23 TO MONITOR THE CIA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, last Thursday I addressed the Senate, urging that it was time for Congress to monitor the CIA. While it is supposed to be a factfinding Agency, in which role it has been notably unsuccessful, as in Cuba and now in Honduras, it has been more than evident, from the information that trickles through, that it is far more than that. It is also an undercover cloak and dagger organization, making its own policies, following its own bent, subject to no control by the Congress, a respect in which it is unique. That uniqueness is undesirable in our democracy.

As I pointed out on the floor of the Senate a year ago last January, when I was in Central America on a mission for the Public Works Committee, inspecting the Inter-American Highway, the head of the U.S. mission in one of the Central American countries told me that the CIA was active there, that it had a lot of money to spend, that it was promoting candidacies of individuals which were not in accord with the instructions and policies which our mission was receiving from the State Department.

It has been more than evident in Vietnam that the CIA there has been in conflict with the policies of the State Department and the efforts of our new Ambassador, Henry Cabot Lodge.

It is high time we sought to prevent such intragovernmental conflict. I referred in my remarks to the pertinent criticism of that situation voiced in the Senate on September 20 by the distinguished majority leader the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

My proposal would slightly amend concurrent resolution 23 offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], that a watchdog committee over the CIA, consisting of both House and Senate Members, and composed of three each from the Foreign Relations, Armed Services, and Government Operations Committees of the Senate as well as from corresponding committees of the House, be enacted.

I note with interest that the New York Times yesterday, October 6, editorially endorsed such a policy. In an editorial entitled "State Within a State?" it says that the CIA "has gone too long without adequate congressional responsibility" and it urges "that a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence should be established to monitor our intelligence services, to safeguard their security and

to reduce the dangers secret espionage and covert operations present to a free society."

I ask unanimous consent that the Times editorial, "State Within a State?" be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE WITHIN A STATE

Is the Central Intelligence Agency a state within a state?

President Kennedy's recall of the head of CIA operations in South Vietnam, coming after persistent reports of discomfiture between him and Ambassador Lodge, appears to provide substantive corroboration to the long-voiced charges that our intelligence organization too often tends to "make" policy.

The CIA is a large and, on the whole, well-organized intelligence apparatus, which knows and employs all the tricks of the trade. But it not only gathers intelligence, it operates saboteurs, guerrillas, and other paramilitary forces. And its operators—particularly if they are not carefully programmed, controlled, and directed—tend whimsically to influence policy, if not to make it.

The Agency has many extremely able men. But it operates behind the cloak of anonymity and secrecy—and secrecy adds to power. When the same organization collects intelligence and evaluates it, and, at the same time, conducts clandestine operations—and when that organization is as powerful and as well financed as the CIA—there is an inevitable tendency for some of its personnel to assume the functions of king-makers.

Communist imperialism and the exigencies of the nuclear age have brought us sons away—whether we like it or not—from the era of 1929, when Secretary of State Stimson closed the Nation's only congressional organization with the remark that "gentlemen do not read each other's mail." Today we must read the other fellow's mail if we want to survive.

But the CIA, like the FBI, has gone too long without adequate congressional accountability. A Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence, so long urged but so often frustrated by congressional pride of place and petty jealousies, should be established to monitor our intelligence services, to safeguard their security and to reduce the dangers secret espionage and covert operations present to a free society.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. MORSE. I join the Senator from Alaska in the comments he is making critical of the CIA. I particularly commend the New York Times for the penetrating editorial which the Senator has placed in the RECORD.

As the Senator from Alaska knows, I also have been disturbed for a long time about the unchecked powers of the CIA. I have said on the floor of the Senate many times—and I repeat to day—that it is not safe in a democracy to have any segment of government exercising unchecked powers. When I speak of unchecked powers, I mean powers unchecked by the legislative branch of the Government, because we cannot operate this system of government in keeping with its constitutional intent and purpose if we take away from the Legislature the power to check any segment of the Government.

I am disturbed by what I hear from members of the Appropriations Committee, to the effect that after all, the Ap-

17790

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

October 7

appropriations Committee has some sort of check on the CIA. There are members of the Appropriations Committee who tell me that is not a check of any substance.

I repeat: The Congress is ducking its responsibilities in respect to the CIA. The Congress owes to the American people the placing of a clear legislative check on the CIA. The only way we can check it is to set up a congressional watchdog committee with authority and power to require from the CIA every bit of intelligence information the Congress thinks it ought to have in order to protect the operation of this system of government by checks and balances, because the alternative is the development of a creeping police state within the Government of the United States. That is developing. One cannot explain on governmental theory the unchecked power of the CIA except on the basis of the fact—and it is an ugly fact—that there is a creeping police state power developing within this democracy. It is a cancer which must be removed. The only way we can remove it is for the Congress to assume its clear constitutional duties as well as powers in respect to the CIA.

Mr. GRUENING. I could not agree more with my friend the senior Senator from Oregon. The CIA, operating in secret, as the Senator properly says, performing wholly contrary to our American traditions and our professions, is supposed to be a fact-finding Agency. It has been notably unsuccessful as a fact-finding Agency. It was wrong on Cuba. It misled us grievously with the result that Cuba has Castro and his Communist tyranny. It certainly contributed to the Bay of Pigs fiasco. It was apparently wrong on Honduras. Only 24 hours before the revolt the State Department let it be known—and presumably the State Department had access to the CIA's information—that no revolt was coming. Yet it "popped."

In addition to that, we know the CIA is far more than a fact-finding Agency. An article in the New Republic, a responsible publication, about a year ago, stated flatly that the CIA was responsible for an assassination in a Caribbean country.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The 5 minutes for which the Senator was recognized have expired.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I shall take only 1 minute more.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is the Senate operating under controlled time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is. The Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] yielded such time as he wished to the Senator from Alaska, within his time limitation.

Mr. GRUENING. I shall need only 1 minute more.

I do not know whether that charge was true. The mere fact that a responsible publication could make the charge that the CIA was responsible for the assassination of a political leader in a Caribbean republic should have been enough to bring about a congressional investi-

gation and the kind of action I urge, which the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] has proposed, and the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] so heartily and correctly endorses.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield me a minute?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations of the Committee on Government Operations may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, how much time have I under my control on the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington has 25 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, if it is inconvenient for the Senator to yield, I am authorized to use time on this side.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Why not use 5 minutes of the time under the control of the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York yields himself 5 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, how much time is there?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington has 25 minutes. The Senator from New York yields himself 5 minutes. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Chair.

RADIO ASTRONOMY SERVICE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, last Friday the Federal Communications Commission completed action in a rule-making proceeding of widespread public interest involving the future of the radio astronomy service. Its decision, I am heartened to report, was that channel 37, an optimum radio astronomy frequency, would be retained in the frequency allocation but would not be licensed for commercial purposes for a period of 10 years, that is, until at least January 1, 1974.

Mr. President, radio astronomy research is a vital part of our national scientific effort to uncover some of the dark secrets of outer space, with great present and potential practical value for the U.S. space program. Around the country, indeed around the world, both publicly and privately supported radio astronomy facilities have an intense stake in an exclusive frequency which will be protected on a longrun basis

from any and all manmade interference. Any erosion of the protection afforded such a frequency as channel 37 would be extremely detrimental to the future progress of radio astronomy and wasteful of the sizable investment in facilities which has so far been made; and it may well be that the 10-year protection just ordered by the FCC will not prove to be a sufficient guaranty of protection for the long-range needs of the program.

Nevertheless, the FCC is to be commended for its recognition of the broad public interest inherent in the radio astronomy service. I know that the institutions and companies in New York State which now maintain radio astronomy facilities or which are planning to install them in the future together with the thousands employed by them—to mention only several, Cornell University, the Hayden Planetarium, and the General Electric Co.—will welcome the FCC decision of last week.

It is my intention, however, to seek out scientific opinion in order to determine whether the action that was taken stopped short of fulfilling the permanent objectives of the program, and I will certainly want to make sure, if further protection should be necessary, that it will be afforded at the proper time.

KINGS COUNTY COUNCIL OF THE JEWISH WAR VETERANS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, each year the Kings County Council of the Jewish War Veterans are hosts to hospitalized veterans at Yankee Stadium. For a day, the council provides activities and amusements for these Veterans—many of whom rarely see the outside of hospital walls.

Mr. President, the Kings County Council of the Jewish War Veterans—in fact, all Americans—have not forgotten their obligation to their war veterans—men who have given so much in the name of America and freedom. Because of my admiration for the activities of the Jewish War Veterans of America, I have introduced legislation in this Congress which would incorporate this group. If enacted, this legislation would grant Federal recognition to this organization. It is my hope that my bill will be favorably acted upon in the near future.

Mr. President, I salute the Kings County Council of the Jewish War Veterans for brightening the day for many of our hospitalized veterans. Their unselfish gesture deserves the gratitude of the entire Nation.

SITUATION IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in an unprecedented move, South Vietnam's Ambassador to the United States, Tran Van Chuong, resigned his post in opposition to the policies of President Ngo Dinh Diem.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an interesting interview by Jock Lawrence with Ambassador Chuong which appeared in a recent issue of the Washington World.

1963

There is much legitimate concern about the possibility that we will be denying future generations the use of valuable minerals and valuable essential sources of water if we close off these areas for wilderness preservation. This provision that I have read to you is apparently intended to make people who are not familiar with the realities of the situation believe that the wilderness bill does not lock up these mineral resources about which everyone is concerned. You and I know that the provision doesn't mean a thing because nobody is going to risk the capital investment required for exploration today unless he has an assurance that he will be permitted to develop a mine if he makes a discovery. The Senate-passed wilderness bill denies this assurance.

Likewise, we will expose in the House of Representatives the fact that the proposed authority of the President to permit prospecting and mining is meaningless except in the context of anticipating the day when the United States has no mineral resources any place else. The mining industry and its friends know how long it takes to find and develop a mine. We recognize that it is ridiculous to say that these resources, although locked up, will be available in the event of an emergency—time just would not permit finding and developing mineral resources after we are enmeshed in an emergency situation.

My conclusion, therefore, is that if we are going to have wilderness legislation there must be realistic provisions relating to the discovery and development of our mineral resources. I assure you that if a bill is reported out of my subcommittee it will have simple, unmistakable language that even the lawyers will understand, prescribing the guidelines for any restriction on mining activity.

Last year, when the House Interior Committee reported a wilderness bill that represented an effort by the committee to effect a compromise between the proponents and opponents of wilderness legislation, 6,822,400 acres of forest land were classified by the Forest Service as "wilderness," "wild," and "canoe"; and the House committee version of the wilderness bill would have given these 6.8 million acres of land immediate wilderness status subject to continued mineral exploration and development for a 25-year period. In the year that has passed since that bill was reported out, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Chief of the Forest Service have added over a million and a half acres in these categories so that there are now 8,391,648 acres in wilderness, wild, and canoe areas.

Areas presently classified as, and given wilderness protection by the Department of Agriculture, restrict the type of use that can be made of the areas. Miners have demonstrated that they can prospect for and develop the mineral resources while preserving the wilderness characteristics. In answer to some of the arguments that maintain that the wilderness areas possess no mineral values, we have a report prepared by the Chief of the Forest Service indicating that, since the first wilderness bill was passed by the Senate September 6, 1961, 350 mining claims were filed in wilderness and wild areas and an additional 187 claims have been filed in primitive areas within the national forests.

These statistics point up a few things: (1) There are mineral resources in the areas embraced by the wilderness bill; (2) prospectors are willing to enter these undeveloped areas in search of valuable minerals; and (3) the 350 acres in wilderness and wild areas, at 20 acres per claim, would involve 7,000 acres out of over 8 million acres, or less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the area that would have been given wilderness protection by both the Senate bill and the House committee bill of last year. Incidentally, I do not know what method the

Chief of the Forest Service used but he estimated that, of the 350 claims, only 88 "may be valid," thereby reducing to 1,760 acres the area in which we may expect mining development to take place. I do not think that mining threatens the wilderness.

The bill reported out by the House committee last Congress tried to compromise the mining issue by providing the 25-year period I referred to earlier, during which mining would be permitted and after which the lands would be withdrawn from appropriation under the mining laws. Let us review some of the other important provisions of that bill.

The wilderness, wild, and canoe areas have been identified with preciseness; however, the primitive areas must still be delineated. Therefore, we can blanket in the wilderness, wild, and canoe areas because we know exactly what land is affected. But we cannot do the same with the primitive areas because even the wilderness advocates recognize that these areas must be reviewed. Only after they have been reviewed can we in Congress pass on whether specific areas should be given wilderness protection.

The committee sought to preserve the traditional position of Congress as making policy in the field of land management and leaving it up to the Executive to carry out those policy guidelines. If, on top of the protection given by the executive branch to these wilderness areas, we are going to provide legislative protection, it is necessary for Congress to pass on each individual area.

At this point, let me give you an example of what I consider to be a weakness in the Senate wilderness bill: Under section 3(b)(1) of S. 4, the Secretary of Agriculture would review the primitive areas and then the President would submit his "recommendations," which would become final unless vetoed by Congress, providing for any alteration in the boundaries of the primitive areas subject to the proviso that any primitive area recommended for inclusion in the wilderness system could not be larger in area than the amount classified as primitive on the effective date of the act. In some of the primitive areas there are thousands of acres of land devoted to uses, such as roads, that are incompatible with wilderness. The Senate bill would therefore permit the Department to drop out 10,000 or 50,000 or more acres of roads or other uses and substitute 50,000 acres of land that might be potentially valuable for resource development; or, to put the example in practical terms, the Executive could drop 50,000 acres of rocks, stones, and rattlesnakes and include in the wilderness 50,000 acres of mature timber. In order to make certain that Congress acts based on full knowledge of the facts, I assure you that, if there is going to be a wilderness bill, there will be provision for affirmative action by Congress after the Chief Executive or his Cabinet officers have made their review and submitted their recommendations to the Congress.

We have not scheduled any hearings on wilderness legislation because, right at the moment, there seems to be no point in doing so. Should it develop that the wilderness proponents are willing to move in the direction of the compromise offered by the House committee last year, I would be willing to schedule hearings on this legislation.

I recognize the fact that no direct specific testimony was received by our committee on the proposals offered by the House committee. Accordingly, if the House of Representatives recesses during November and legislation along the lines of the House committee compromise wilderness bill seems possible, I will seek authority to hold hearings in the West on proposals that might lead to such compromise along the lines of that bill. If the House does not take a recess, then it seems to me the best we can hope for would be to have the staff work com-

pleted this fall and to hold hearings in Washington in the early part of next year, relying on national organizations such as yours to obtain the views of the people of the West on the specific proposals contained in the House committee bill.

I am pleased to have had this opportunity to discuss this legislation with you on the same platform with the chairman of our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; I feel certain that he will continue to support me in my views that hearings on the wilderness legislation would serve no purpose unless we have some advance indication or assurance that the wilderness advocates will move in the direction of the House committee bill.

PRESENTED AT THE PUBLIC LANDS SESSION, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1963, AMERICAN MINING CONGRESS MINING CONVENTION, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., BY THE HONORABLE JOHN P. SAYLOR, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues in the House, and colleagues on the panel, and friends, having been the individual in Congress who introduced in the House of Representatives the first wilderness bill and who introduced the bill to modernize the mining laws and after hearing the comments that have been made, I take consolidation in the fact that in the dark days of President Lincoln's administration when he looked everywhere for friends and could find few, he was delighted one day to have call upon him a group of people that he had known in Springfield, Ill. They asked him, "Mr. President, how do you like your job?" It is reported that he leaned back in his chair and stretched his long legs and looked at them and said "Well I'll tell you it reminds me very, very much of the man who had been tarred and feathered and was being ridden out of town on a rail," and he said "that if it wouldn't have been for the honor he would just as soon have waked."

Now many people have asked me why you from Pennsylvania take an interest in the West. Let me tell you that I come from an area in Pennsylvania—and I'm delighted to look out in this crowd and see a former Johnstown, Mr. Williams, who is here as one of the officials of the Colorado Fuel & Iron Co.—he can tell you that in the section of Pennsylvania from which we come—we are very much interested in mining. And I am delighted to have this opportunity to come here and talk to you, because, sometimes, it is from those who are not in your organization that you might find some of the things that are causing other people to look at you askance. One year ago at this meeting, Chairman ASPINALL said this to you "one of the difficulties of the public lands laws including the mining law is that they have been in existence for a long time without an overall review and overhaul. The scope of the mining law of 1872 has been curtailed by the Mineral Leasing Act. The procedure, however, for locatable minerals remains exactly the same despite the fact that just about everything else in the United States has changed." And I'd like one year later, to say "Amen" to that statement—because it's true—even truer today than a year ago.

One of the reasons that I have introduced a bill to revise the mining laws is that there are groups and people in this country that look upon you as despoilers. This I do not believe. But unless something is done by the American mining industry to help create a better atmosphere and a better impression among the American people, you are in trouble. If you are afraid of change—then you are in more trouble. If you want to hang on to what you have and say that a hundred years ago it was given to you and that you will not move from your present position—I am afraid that some day in the near future

you may have many things handed to you that will not be to your liking. And, because I believe that a great, a healthy and a prosperous mining industry in this country is one of the real cornerstones of the American economy, I have tried to issue a challenge to the American mining industry.

Now I do not at this time or at any other time want to tell you that I have all the solutions to your problems because I know that I do not. But I hope that my approach may cause you—the brains of a great industry—to think about your present job and about your future.

Before I introduced the bill to revise the mining laws I sent it to a number of my friends in the mining industry and it came back with this remarkable analysis. Those men that I classify as middle age and over, all thought it was terrible and those that I classify as below middle age—I mean by that those younger than myself—all thought it was marvelous.

Now let me see what I have tried to do. This bill has two purposes. First, it would protect the interest of the legitimate prospectors and miners by establishing an orderly procedure for the exploration and discovery of mineral deposits and the patenting of mining claims on public lands. I might tell you folks that you are one of the few groups in this country that has the right to get a patent but believe it or not there are other groups in this country that are looking at this right that you have and saying that if the miners have it, why can't we. Just a few days ago, in Washington, when our committee was conducting hearings on Chairman ASPINALL's bill, H.R. 8070, to provide a commission for the overall review of the public land laws, a representative of the cattle industry, and a very able representative, stated that when cattlemen go on the public range and they place developments on the public range, why should they not be given the right to get a patent to that land just as the miner does when he discovers a mineral. Let me tell you, my friends, that you've got a hard answer to come up with because the cattle industry is also an important cornerstone in this great country of ours and they, too, use large sections of this public domain and they have improved our range and they have prevented rushing washoffs and rapid runoffs and they're spending their money to make sure that they can continue to have a healthy operation.

The second purpose of the mining revision bill that I introduced is to protect the overall public interest in public lands, on which mining activities are permitted, by assuring that mining is conducted in a manner compatible with other multiple-use objectives of the public lands.

Now the legitimate miner has been held up to public ridicule and scorn because of the weekend miner. A man who takes advantage of the loopholes in the law of 1872 to get himself a piece of the public domain under the guise of mining and who gets a personal and preferential use in outstanding recreation, scenic, hunting and fishing areas, is abusing the law and bringing criticism on all. One of the outstanding cases is one that occurred a few years ago in the State just north of here. You are all familiar with it. Patents were issued under the guise of mining. Let me tell you that the payroll, as shown by the reports that were filed, would not have paid for the 8 years' assessment work on the claims; but, in the meantime, on the lands which were patented, over 2 million board feet of valuable timber was cut. Oh, they got a little mineral, that's true; but they didn't get much. And I am satisfied that it was never the purpose to get minerals in the first place.

Now if your industry really believes that

you can stand on the law of 1872 then I as an easterner warn you today—and as a friend I warn you—that you are in trouble. I hope that from this convention you, who are the brains of the industry, will come forward not only to your Congress, but to your Secretary of Interior and to your Secretary of Agriculture, with a constructive revision program so that in the years to come we may continue to have a healthy American mining industry.

QUESTIONS ON PROPOSED UNITED STATES AND RUSSIAN COLLABORATION ON MAN-ON-THE-MOON PROJECT

(Mr. JOHANSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, apropos of the President's recent proposal that the United States and Soviet Russia collaborate on the man-on-the-moon project, I respectfully raise these two questions:

First. If this moon-shot project is not expected to contribute substantially to our military know-how and national defense, how can we justify to the American taxpayers the many billion dollars of cost which it involves?

Second. If it is definitely anticipated that this project will develop vital military information and thus contribute to national defense, how can we justify making Soviet Russia a partner in the project, and, therefore, a cobeneficiary of that vital military information?

I would like to hear an uncensored and unexpurgated answer to these two questions from the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

PROPOSED JOINT COMMITTEE TO SUPERVISE CIA

(Mr. LINDSAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the growing press reports to the effect that there has been a breakdown of relations, even of communication, between the State Department and the CIA in South Vietnam can no longer be ignored. It is bad enough that U.S. policy in this part of the world can, at best, be described as "misunderstood"—and therefore clumsy—but when clumsy policy is divided up between quarreling U.S. agencies it is even worse. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] has just referred to an additional press report of the divisions, disagreements, and breakdowns in communication between the State Department and the Central Intelligence Agency in South Vietnam. Now if these reports are right, we should not be sitting still. If they are wrong, they should be exposed as false and the record set straight. In any event it seems plain that there have been leaks from one agency or the other or both.

Eighteen Members of the House of Representatives, I among them, have introduced resolutions calling for the creation of a joint committee to supervise the intelligence community. At

least two Members of the other body have introduced identical resolutions. A few weeks ago I spoke for an hour on the floor on this subject. I think we Members of the House would not be living up to our obligations as legislators were we to ignore this question.

Recently Hanson Baldwin, distinguished journalist and expert on military and security affairs—a person who individually believes in executive control in matters of this kind—has written a section major article on the U.S. intelligence community and has again pointed to the absence of congressional supervision over this giant, billion-dollar complex.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION PROGRAM

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include a speech by the Director of the Rural Electrification Administration.)

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, so much is being said about the job of rural electrification being finished that there is a real danger Members of the Congress may be misled into accepting a false impression of this vital and constructive program.

It is refreshing then to have the views of the man who is in position to gage the status of rural electrification today, the very able Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, Norman M. Clapp. These views are being expressed by Mr. Clapp in a series of meetings around the country with the men and women who direct and manage the rural electric cooperatives which have wrought a miracle in bringing the benefits of electricity to areas far from the central station plants which produce light and power for our cities and suburbs.

In this speech Administrator Clapp is proposing "A Program for Growth" which he believes is necessary if the rural power systems are to succeed in achieving the objectives of the Rural Electrification Act. Toward this goal, he proposes an orderly and businesslike approach to the unfinished business of rural electrification through a program which will permit the rural electric systems to become self-sustaining.

It should be understood that the proposals and the program he offers are the product of his experience and deep personal interest in REA, cooperative rural electrification, and the development of rural America. He has brought to this task the background of his long and close association with the rural electric cooperatives in his native Wisconsin, and the habit, which he developed while publishing a county seat newspaper, of weighing a situation fairly and objectively, in meeting his obligation to all the people. Thus he has shaped a policy which he believes will serve the interests of every American, while helping to assure the future security and effectiveness of the rural systems which serve those who created them, the 5 million member-owners of the REA-financed rural electric cooperatives.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17697

Mr. MANSFIELD. I did not read the story.

Mr. JAVITS. I am sorry. The story states that the Senate Commerce Committee expects to finish its work on the public accommodations bill today. It also states:

The chairman, Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, said the Senate might then use it as the vehicle for a general civil rights debate, without waiting for the House to act.

But the majority leader, MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, threw cold water on this idea. He said taking up civil rights with firm agreement on only one part of the bill would open the way to innumerable amendments and endless debate.

Thus, the prospect still is that the House will act first and that its bill will be intercepted when it reaches the Senate. The outlook is for a Senate civil rights debate that will go on until Christmas Eve—and possibly longer.

The Magnuson approach, as indicated by the article, is what I have long been contending for; and the Senator from Montana has been steadfast in his view that the way to do it is to intercept the House bill. I was giving my opinion that this would cost 4 more weeks in debate than if the Senate took the Commerce Committee bill. I was also referring to the rumor that the White House has adopted the view that the civil rights bill should precede consideration of the tax bill. I agree with that view, and I was giving my reasons, in terms of domestic tranquility, which I think is occasioned by the delay in dealing with the civil rights issue by Congress, why I thought the Magnuson prescription was the right one.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Times story states my position accurately; namely, that so far as the Senator from Montana is concerned, it is not his intention to call up the Magnuson proposal for the reasons enumerated. The Senate would spend much more time on civil rights if it operated on that basis than if it awaited a bill from the House.

I have previously stated my position. The Senator from New York and I are unchanging in our position.

Mr. JAVITS. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. For the past month or more, he has wanted the Senate to get to work on the proposal in the Commerce Committee, and for the past month or more I have said that it would be my intention, if I had my way, to wait for the House to pass its bill, meet it at the door, place it on the calendar, and then face up, not merely to a part of the civil rights bill, but to the whole, or as much of the whole as possible.

It is the intention of the leadership to consider both a civil rights bill and a tax bill. If by chance the tax bill is available before the civil rights bill from the House is, it would be my intention at the moment to call up the tax bill first. But that is something which only the future will be able to give us a look into. All I want to emphasize is that I am in favor of taking up the civil rights

bill as it comes from the House, and that, so far as the tax bill and the civil rights bill are concerned, it is our intention to consider both of them, no matter how long it requires.

The Senator has mentioned Christmas. If it takes to the end of the time for legal adjournment of the first session of the 88th Congress, which is January 1 of next year, we will go that long, if we are not finished, and, if need be, we will continue with the next session immediately.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator has correctly stated that our positions have not changed. I feel as strongly as he does; and I think he is making a great mistake. The civil rights debate should be started as soon as it is possible, which is as soon as the Commerce Committee makes its report. Of course, it is possible to offer amendments to other bills, as was done the other day in extending the life of the Civil Rights Commission, but that method does not get much support, understandably, except when it is absolutely essential, and it sometimes is. But I believe the report of the Commerce Committee, which has been promised soon, will be the showdown in this situation.

I understood very well that the majority leader had not changed his view, but I thought it advisable to make it clear, in view of the support of the position I have taken by the chairman of the Commerce Committee, or, at least, which has been implied to be the position of the chairman of the Commerce Committee. Of course, the chairman of the Commerce Committee will speak for himself if he feels the newspaper article gives the wrong implication so far as he is concerned.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senator from Alaska has asked me to yield to him before I make a rather extended speech on East-West trade. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 5 minutes to him, and I beg my colleague to confine himself to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

IT IS TIME FOR CONGRESS TO MONITOR THE CIA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished majority leader's attention, because reference is made to him in these remarks with respect to the CIA.

Mr. President, for some time now many of us in the Congress have been gravely concerned about the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency. This is the one agency of the Federal Government which operates "on its own" without the customary supervision and control normally exercised over other Federal departments and agencies.

Yesterday, under the headline "Richard Starnes Reveals Arrogant CIA Disobeys Orders in Vietnam," the Washington Daily News apparently confirms the basis for our concern. I ask unanimous

consent that the text of Mr. Starnes' article be printed in full in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. This story underlines the remarks made on the floor of the Senate on September 29, 1963, by the able and distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] when he admonished the U.S. agencies in South Vietnam to work in harmony and reminded them that the Ambassador to that country, Mr. Lodge, was in charge of directing all their activities.

The majority leader stated in part:

Mr. President, if this large contingent of Americans is so to function, there can be in Vietnam only one channel through which direction can flow. The President and the Secretary of State cannot set up headquarters in Saigon; but they do have in that tortured city an eminently qualified man who does speak for them—and is the only man who should speak for them—with their paramount authority in this matter. That is the Ambassador, Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, our former colleague, and an outstanding American in every respect.

I wish to associate myself with his remarks.

I also ask unanimous consent that the pertinent column by Arthur Krock appearing in the New York Times this morning be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. GRUENING. Early last year, while on a mission for the Senate Committee on Public Works in Central America, I discussed the CIA situation with our Ambassador to one of these Central American countries. He said there was a well-financed CIA mission in that country which did not keep him informed of its activities, but that he was certain that it was working at cross-purposes with the objectives the Department of State had instructed him to seek in that country. This would appear to be a repetition of the situation in Vietnam.

Some time ago I joined with the able and distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] in cosponsoring Senate Concurrent Resolution 23 to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence. That concurrent resolution is now before the Senate Committee on Rules, and I do hope that that committee will take prompt action.

I notice present on the floor the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration [Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina].

I have spoken and written to Senator SMATHERS previously and suggested that besides representatives from the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the House and Senate Committees on the Armed Services, there should be representation from the Senate and House Committees on Government Operations.

He was favorably inclined to this suggestion.

October 3

When I first wrote to Senator SMATHERS on February 26, 1963, I expressed belief that:

The security agencies of this Nation should be under a measure of congressional control.

This has become more apparent daily.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my letter of February 26, 1963, and Senator SMATHERS' response, be reprinted in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 26, 1963.

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GEORGE: I agree that the security agencies of this Nation should be under a measure of congressional control and I am pleased to cosponsor your concurrent resolution 23 which would establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence.

The resolution specifies that there would be six members each from the Senate and the House of Representatives. It further states that these representatives would be selected from the Central Intelligence Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations and the Central Intelligence Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services in each body.

I hope you will find acceptable an amendment I intend to offer which would further specify that the membership of the Joint Committee on Central Intelligence include three members each from the Senate and House Committee on Government Operations.

Both have subcommittees which are concerned with our national security. The Senate Government Operations Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations chaired by Senator JACKSON works directly with the President and with the national security agencies. The recent enlargement of the Senate Government Operations Committee will facilitate its services.

Should you feel that a total membership of 18 would be unwieldy it might be feasible to have two members each from the three committees, rather than three.

With best wishes, I remain

Cordially yours,

ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
February 28, 1963.

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR ERNEST: I have your letter of February 26 and am very pleased to have you as a cosponsor of a concurrent resolution introduced by me to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence.

I have noted your suggested amendment to the proposed resolution and most certainly would have no objection. As a matter of fact, I feel that the amendment would be a good one.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE A. SMATHERS,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. GRUENING. Accordingly, Mr. President, I am today submitting an amendment to Senate Concurrent Resolution 23 to accomplish that purpose. I ask that this amendment be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks and that it lie at the desk until the close of business on October 10, 1963, to give those of my colleagues who wish to do so an opportunity to join me in cosponsoring this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD and lie on the desk as requested.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

On the first page, line 3, beginning with "six" strike out all through "four" in line 6, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "nine Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and nine Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Of the nine Members to be appointed from the Senate three shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, three shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, and three shall be members of the National Security Staffing and Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations of the Senate. Of the nine Members to be appointed from the House of Representatives three shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the House of Representatives, three shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the House of Representatives on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and three shall be members of the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives. Not more than six".

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Daily News, Oct. 2, 1963]

SPOOKS MAKE LIFE MISERABLE FOR AMBASSADOR LODGE—ARROGANT CIA DISOBEYS ORDERS IN VIETNAM

(By Richard Starnes)

SAIGON, October 2.—The story of the Central Intelligence Agency's role in South Vietnam is a dismal chronicle of bureaucratic arrogance, obstinate disregard of orders, and unrestrained thirst for power.

Twice the CIA flatly refused to carry out instructions from Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, according to a high U.S. source here. In one of these instances the CIA frustrated a plan of action Mr. Lodge brought with him from Washington, because the Agency disagreed with it.

This led to a dramatic confrontation between Mr. Lodge and John Richardson, chief of the huge CIA apparatus here. Mr. Lodge failed to move Mr. Richardson, and the dispute was bucked back to Washington. Secretary of State Dean Rusk and CIA Chief John A. McCone were unable to resolve the conflict, and the matter is now reported to be awaiting settlement by President Kennedy.

It is one of the developments expected to be covered in Defense Secretary Robert McNamara's report to Mr. Kennedy.

OTHERS CRITICAL, TOO

Other American agencies here are incredibly bitter about the CIA.

"If the United States ever experiences a 'Seven Days in May' it will come from the CIA, and not the Pentagon," one U.S. official commented caustically.

("Seven Days in May" is a fictional account of an attempted military coup to take over the U.S. Government.)

CIA "spooks" (a universal term for secret agents here) have penetrated every branch of the American community in Saigon, until nonspook Americans here almost seem to be suffering a CIA psychosis.

An American field officer with a distinguished combat career speaks angrily about "that man at headquarters in Saigon wearing a colonel's uniform." He means the man is a CIA agent, and he can't understand what he is doing at U.S. military headquarters here, unless it is spying on other Americans.

Another American officer, talking about the CIA, acidly commented: "You'd think they'd have learned something from Cuba but apparently they didn't."

FEW KNOW CIA STRENGTH

Few people other than Mr. Richardson and his close aids know the actual CIA strength here, but a widely used figure is 600. Many are clandestine agents known only to a few of their fellow spooks.

Even Mr. Richardson is a man about whom it is difficult to learn much in Saigon. He is said to be a former OSS officer, and to have served with distinction in the CIA in the Philippines.

A surprising number of the spooks are known to be involved in their ghostly trade and some make no secret of it.

"There are spooks in the U.S. Information Service, in the U.S. operations mission, in every aspect of American official and commercial life here," one official—presumably a nonspook—said.

"They represent a tremendous power and total unaccountability to anyone," he added.

Coupled with the ubiquitous secret police of Ngo Dinh Nhu, a surfeit of spooks has given Saigon an oppressive police state atmosphere.

The Nhu-Richardson relationship is a subject of lively speculation. The CIA continues to pay the special forces which conducted brutal raids on Buddhist temples last August 21, although in fairness it should be pointed out that the CIA is paying these goons for the war against Communist guerrillas, not Buddhist bonzes (priests).

HANDS OVER MILLIONS

Nevertheless, on the first of every month, the CIA dutifully hands over a quarter million American dollars to pay these special forces.

Whatever else it buys, it doesn't buy any solid information on what the special forces are up to. The August 21 raids caught top U.S. officials here and in Washington flat-footed.

Nhu ordered the special forces to crush the Buddhist priests, but the CIA wasn't let in on the secret. (Some CIA button men now say they warned their superiors what was coming up, but in any event the warning of harsh repression was never passed to top officials here or in Washington.)

Consequently, Washington reacted unsurely to the crisis. Top officials here and at home were outraged at the news the CIA was paying the temple raiders, but the CIA continued the payments.

It may not be a direct subsidy for a religious war against the country's Buddhist majority, but it comes close to that.

And for every State Department aid here who will tell you, "Dammit, the CIA is supposed to gather information, not make policy, but policymaking is what they're doing here," there are military officers who scream over the way the spooks dabble in military operations.

A TYPICAL EXAMPLE

For example, highly trained trail watchers are an important part of the effort to end Vietcong infiltration from across the Lao and Cambodian borders. But if the trail watchers spot incoming Vietcongs, they report it to the CIA in Saigon, and in the fullness of time, the spooks may tell the military.

One very high American official here, a man who has spent much of his life in the service of democracy, likened the CIA's growth to a malignancy, and added he was

1963

not sure even the White House could control it any longer.

Unquestionably Mr. McNamara and Gen. Maxwell Taylor both got an earful from people who are beginning to fear the CIA is becoming a third force, coequal with President Diem's regime and the U.S. Government—answerable neither.

There is naturally the highest interest here as to whether Mr. McNamara will persuade Mr. Kennedy something ought to be done about it.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the New York Times, Oct. 3, 1963.]

IN THE NATION: THE INTRA-ADMINISTRATION WAR IN VIETNAM

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, October 2.—The Central Intelligence Agency is getting a very bad press in dispatches from Vietnam to American newspapers and in articles originating in Washington. Like the Supreme Court when under fire, the CIA cannot defend itself in public retorts to criticisms of its activities as they occur. But, unlike the Supreme Court, the CIA has no open record of its activities on which the public can base a judgment of the validity of the criticisms. Also, the Agency is precluded from using the indirect defensive tactic which is constantly employed by all other Government units under critical fire.

This tactic is to give information to the press, under a seal of confidence, that challenges or refutes the critics. But the CIA cannot father such inspired articles, because to do so would require some disclosure of its activities. And not only does the effectiveness of the Agency depend on the secrecy of its operations. Every President since the CIA was created has protected this secrecy from claimants—Congress or the public through the press, for example—of the right to share any part of it.

WITH HIGH FREQUENCY

This Presidential policy has not, however, always restrained other executive units from going confidentially to the press with attacks on CIA operations in their common field of responsibility. And usually it has been possible to deduce these operational details from the nature of the attacks. But the peak of the practice has recently been reached in Vietnam and in Washington. This is revealed almost everyday now in dispatches from reporters—in close touch with intra-administration critics of the CIA—with excellent reputations for reliability.

One reporter in this category is Richard Starnes of the Scripps-Howard newspapers. Today, under a Saigon dateline, he related that, according to a high U.S. source here, twice the CIA flatly refused to carry out instructions from Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge * * * (and) in one instance frustrated a plan of action Mr. Lodge brought from Washington because the Agency disagreed with it. Among the views attributed to U.S. officials on the scene, including one described as a very high American official * * * who has spent much of his life in the service of democracy * * * are the following:

The CIA's growth was likened to a malignancy which the very high official was not sure even the White House could control * * * any longer. If the United States ever experiences (an attempt at a coup to overthrow the Government) it will come from the CIA and not the Pentagon. The Agency represents a tremendous power and total unaccountability to anyone.

DISORDERLY GOVERNMENT

Whatever else these passages disclose, they most certainly establish that representatives of other executive branches have expanded their war against the CIA from the inner Government councils to the American people via the press. And published simultaneously are details of the Agency's operations in Viet-

nam that can come only from the same critical official sources. This is disorderly government. And the longer the President tolerates it—the period already is considerable—the greater will its potentials of hampering the real war against the Vietcong and the impression of a very indecisive administration in Washington.

The CIA may be guilty as charged. Since it cannot, or at any rate will not, openly defend its record in Vietnam, or defend it by the same confidential press briefings employed by its critics, the public is not in a position to judge. Nor is this department, which sought and failed to get even the outlines of the Agency's case in rebuttal. But Mr. Kennedy will have to make a judgment if the spectacle of war within the executive branch is to be ended and the effective functioning he makes this judgment, hopefully he also will make it public, as well as the appraisal of fault on which it is based.

Doubtless recommendations as to what his judgment should be were made to him today by Secretary of Defense McNamara and General Taylor on their return from their factfinding expedition into the embattled official jungle in Saigon.

TWENTY-TWO SENATORS REQUEST ADMINISTRATION FIRMNESS IN NOT COUNTENANCING MILITARY OVERTHROW OF DULY CONSTITUTED GOVERNMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, yesterday I joined 21 of my colleagues in sending a telegram to President Kennedy urging him to issue orders withdrawing all U.S. personnel from the diplomatic, military, and AID missions to the Dominican Republic.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the telegram and the names of those who sent it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the point we are making to the President is that so long as our personnel are physically present in the Dominican Republic the statement of the United States that it had broken relations with the illegal military junta which has seized power from the legally constituted government of the Dominican Republic and the stopping of foreign economic assistance are ineffective.

The situation in the Dominican Republic is serious. It threatens the entire Alliance for Progress. If the trend toward the overthrow of duly constituted civilian governments by illegal military juntas is to stop, the time to stop it is now.

Economic development of Latin America cannot be successful in an atmosphere of political unrest. The duly constituted civilian governments cannot carry out economic development plans if they are in constant fear of a military coup. If we condone these military coups we play directly into the hand of the Communists. The Alliance for Progress is tied directly into self-help action by the nations aided in the fields of social and economic reform. If constitutional governments are to be illegally thrown out of office by military coups because they seek to carry out such social and economic reforms, there can be no hope

for the success of the Alliance for Progress.

The United States must make this abundantly clear not by words but by actions.

I said on the floor of the Senate this last Monday:

Because if we do not insist upon the return to constitutional government in the Dominican Republic, then we will be endangering other civilian governments not only in Latin America but in the rest of the world as well. We will be in effect inciting similar military revolts in Venezuela, Columbia, and in other Latin American nations which are trying to establish democratic regimes. We will be playing into the hands of the Communists who will rejoice at the installation of totalitarianism.

This telegram was sent to the President late yesterday afternoon. It was fully reported by radio and TV last night, but it is an interesting fact that it was not considered news by the Washington Post, the New York Times and the New York Herald-Tribune. As an oldtime newspaperman and managing editor of various metropolitan newspapers including one of the three just mentioned, I confess myself puzzled. I would consider that such action by 22 Senators, including three members of the Foreign Relations Committee, to be news. I know that the story was carried in full by the news services, the A.P. and U.P.I. and was therefore available to all dailies in the United States.

The news this morning that the Honduras Government had fallen before a military coup is extremely distressing and serves to make increasingly imperative that the United States make crystal clear that it will not recognize or give financial aid to any illegal military junta or Communist-led revolt which deposes constitutionally elected governments.

EXHIBIT 1

TEXT OF OCTOBER 2, 1963, WIRE SENT TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY BY 22 MEMBERS OF THE SENATE

The President,

The White House:

Success of Alliance for Progress will be enhanced by U.S. action to repudiate illegal military overthrow of civilian Government in Dominican Republic.

Continuance of nonrecognition of military junta and withholding of economic assistance imperative.

To underscore U.S. position and to strengthen remaining Latin American civilian governments, strongly urge issuance immediately with widest publicity, or orders recalling forthwith entire diplomatic, military, and aid missions from Dominican Republic.

Even though assistance has been suspended and announcement of nonrecognition has been made, continued presence in Dominican Republic of missions' personnel is tantamount to giving illegal military junta Government assurances of ultimate recognition and resumption of military and economic aid. All such personnel other than caretaker should be physically withdrawn.

E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, DANIEL BREWSTER, FRANK CHURCH, JOSEPH S. CLARK, PAUL DOUGLAS, ALBERT GORE, ERNEST GRUENING, PHILIP HART, VANCE HARTKE, DANIEL INOUYE, JACOB KAVITS, PAT McNAMARA, WAYNE MOSE, FRANK MOSS, GAYLORD NELSON, JOHN PASTORE, CLAYBORNE PELL, WILLIAM PROXMIRE, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, HARRISON WILLIAMS, JR., RALPH YARBOROUGH, and STEPHEN YOUNG, U.S. Senators.

17700

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

October 3

HELPING AMERICA AND HER YOUTH

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on September 25, 1963, the Senate passed S. 1967, which extends the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 for another 3 years. I was proud to coauthor this legislation with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and colleagues in both parties. I think great progress has been made under this legislation, which Congress approved 2 years ago and which allowed the Federal Government, for the first time, to take major action to assist local communities in coping with their delinquency problems.

We all knew then that the great and complex problem of delinquency was not to be solved overnight. The legislation provided for demonstration projects to test new approaches to delinquency prevention and control, approaches that if successful, might provide guides to many other cities.

I have followed this program closely, both on a national level and as it has developed in Los Angeles, one of the communities receiving a grant for a demonstration project. My investigations have convinced me that this is a sound program, one that promises to reap major benefits in the years to come.

Several guidelines have been established by the Attorney General, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the three members of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, for the administration of this program.

First is the realistic belief that we will find no easy answers to delinquency. The problem is too vast. Broken homes, school dropouts, youth unemployment, racial discrimination, social mobility, inadequate health and housing facilities—all of these contribute to the end result of juvenile delinquency. This complex of problems cannot be successfully attacked just with school programs, or just with recreation, or just with social work, or just with job training. There must be all these efforts, and many more, working together, if we are to get at the roots of the problem.

Thus the first criteria for demonstration projects is that they be comprehensive—attacking the total problem—across the board, not just individual pieces. Unfortunately this has not often been the case. All too frequently public and private youth agencies have had little communication or have been hampered by conflicting points of view and rivalries. But today we can no longer afford the luxury of fragmented, overlapping inefficient efforts against delinquency. To meet the increasing problems of youth, we must have a unified effort.

The second criteria follows from the first. In addition to fighting delinquency on a broad front, we must have top-level local support for such a program. Master plans worked out in an ivory tower will do no good. Mayors, judges, civic and religious leaders, heads of business and labor, and all the others who are vital to community life must be involved. We cannot expect the front-

line workers to do an effective job unless we provide them with full top-level support. We must make it clear that delinquency is everybody's business.

A third belief is that these demonstration projects must be designed by local leaders to address local problems, and must contribute substantial local funds. The President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency has no master plan to impose on every city. Problems differ as cities differ. New York and Houston both have delinquency problems, but we cannot expect the same solutions to apply in both communities. The Committee asks each city to put its best minds to work to find realistic answers to its specific local problems.

I think that even this brief summary indicates that this is an ambitious program, one that is looking ahead to the youth problems of the years to come. To develop demonstration projects that can have important results, the Committee has required cities to go through a preliminary period in which clear goals are set, facts are gathered, new programs are designed, and community support is mobilized. Grants have been made to support these planning periods, so that demonstration projects will be as solid as they possibly can, and the Federal investment can have the best possible return.

There has been some criticism that this planning period is time consuming, and the need is for immediate action. But the fact is that we have had a great deal of action, by a great many people, for many years, but the problem has continued to grow worse. Perhaps what we need most is to take stock, to see what mistakes we have made, and what we have left undone, so that our future expenditures can be more effective. This has been the belief of the Federal program, and what I have seen in Los Angeles has shown me that it is a wise one. This is nothing more than a belief that we should look before we leap, that before we begin spending millions to fight delinquency, we should figure out the best ways to meet the problem.

Los Angeles has every potential for an explosive delinquency situation. Local officials have been able, in recent years, to keep delinquency rates from rising in proportion to the juvenile population. On the other hand, the city's great teenage population increase means that more and more juveniles are getting into trouble, and straining already overcrowded facilities. For every two teenagers in Los Angeles in 1950, there were four in 1960, and this trend will continue. Between 1960 and 1965 the youth population will increase by 50 percent.

There is no doubt that Los Angeles has great resources to meet these problems. Yet local leaders recognize the need to make better use of those existing resources. Soon after the passage of the Delinquency Act, Ernest E. Debs, chairman of the county board of supervisors, called a meeting of key public and private officials to discuss a new attack on delinquency.

This meeting led to the organization of a planning committee to develop a comprehensive approach to Los Angeles

youth problems. The committee included leaders of five major public agencies: the city of Los Angeles, the county of Los Angeles, the city schools, the county schools, and the State employment service. This committee, called the Youth Opportunities Board of Greater Los Angeles, began to draw up a Joint Powers Agreement which under California law, permits agency coalition for joint action to resolve common problems.

In April 1962, the Joint Powers Agreement was signed by Gov. Edmund G. Brown, the heads of the five agencies, and the State director of finance. The agreement set a new precedent in the Los Angeles area as a device for integrating social planning and action on a metropolitan basis. This was the first time State, county, and city agencies in California had set up a structure of such scope to work together on a common problem.

On May 23, 1962, the youth opportunities board received a \$252,906 grant from the Juvenile Delinquency Act to plan a broad-based delinquency prevention and control project.

Each of the five joint powers assigned a full-time representative to the youth opportunities board to assist in program development and serve as liaison to the five agencies. Private groups, labor, and business have supported the board since its inception.

I take pride in the fact that California, under the leadership of Gov. Earl Warren, was in the forefront in developing programs for youth. The Los Angeles Youth Opportunities Board is continuing this tradition of public involvement in youth activities. Republicans and Democrats alike have given their support to this comprehensive program of youth services.

Karl Holton, the respected former chief probation officer of Los Angeles County for 15 years and director of the California Youth Authority for 10 years, is executive director of the board. He was one of 31 recipients of the Freedom Medal, the highest civilian honor, given by the President on July 4.

The youth opportunities board has selected two target areas in the city for a concentration of youth services. A number of "satellite" areas were also chosen to test pilot programs in other parts of the county under the overall structure of the board.

One of the target areas is the site of a youth training and employment program that has been funded by the Department of Labor under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. This program, which was developed and which will be administered by the youth opportunities board, will provide counseling, testing, training, and job placement for 2,500 unemployed youth from 16 to 22 years of age. The board's role in this job program shows its effectiveness as a coordinating structure for youth programs.

This is the first major program developed by the board. A variety of others are being planned based on the data gathered by the research staff and the ideas of staff, agency personnel and citizens.

1200

low had better take a hard look at the facts, namely, 91.6 percent of all taxable income falls below the \$6,000 income level.

Unless the line is drawn and a halt is called, it is obvious where the present tax system will lead us. It is already pinching the low and middle income groups, but a tax reduction that increases the debt will not aid the situation. It will compound the felony.

The advocacy of greater and greater deficits aggravates the crime being perpetrated on the people. To advocate a tax reduction with an increased deficit is like giving a worker a weekly pay increase of a few dollars while at the same time increasing his debt at the department store by many times the amount of the weekly increase in pay.

Despite the high graduation that is already applied at upper income levels, taxpayers in the brackets below \$10,000 pay about 60 percent of the personal income tax revenues presently being collected. This is pointed out on page 15 of an AFL-CIO handbook on Federal taxes, dated September 1960. Supporting figures were drawn from Treasury Department documents.

Our tax system soaks the rich, all right, but it soaks the little man, too. The wage earner on the assembly line in factories can add and subtract. It is becoming increasingly evident to him that the New Frontier group can only multiply.

The average wage earner has to work 2 hours and 19 minutes out of his normal 8-hour workday to pay the taxes imposed by his Federal, State, and local governments, according to a recent report by the Tax Foundation, Inc. By far the biggest hunk goes to Washington.

Until very recently, politicians have been able to sell the idea that their tax packages were always meant for the other fellow. The withholding device has helped to conceal the impact of tax deductions somewhat, but the growing portion of the wage earner's pay that is being siphoned off each year to be spent by bureaucrats—some even to be passed on to the enemies of America—has now become evident to practically everybody.

The myth that the other fellow is going to foot the bill no longer makes much sense to people who know they are already paying a substantial part of their income. If 100 percent of the upper bracket earnings of the Nation were confiscated they would produce enough to run the Federal Government only a few weeks at the most. The rest comes from middle and lower income groups—the only place left. People now realize this.

They also know that expenditures grow automatically if more money is provided. There is no disposition on the part of bureaucrats to pay off past obligations. They tend to feel they are falling down on the job in spending your money if they fail to spend more than they take in.

The administration talks about various kinds of deficits such as "deficits of weakness" and "deficits of strength" and "transitional deficits." I take the latter to be that momentary transitional period between insolvency and bankruptcy.

Whenever additional revenue is made available by any growth of the American economy, the New Frontiersmen have plans for spending it by the time the ink dries on the new estimates. Obviously it is time for a tax cut, but also it is time for a spending cut.

The impact of such free-wheeling irresponsibility by the Government on the wage earner is tremendous. All fair-minded Americans recognize that the rates are even more oppressive in the brackets where all-important capital formation must occur. This does not have any emotional impact on the wage earner, but he knows that somebody must build the plant he works in or finance the business that provides his job.

The American economy—historically the most competitive and most dynamic in the world—has now been stifled into a slow rate of growth. Not so slow as to create hysteria, but slow enough for businessmen and wage earners alike to be concerned. It is so evident that even the New Frontiersmen are beginning to see what has been obvious to many people all along.

Here we are in an era of change, with the dynamic conservatives of the Nation advocating changed policies to meet the challenge. The group which claims the halo of progressiveness for itself would have us continue wallowing in debt and interest which is not comprehensible by me or most taxpayers.

The wage earners of America have a direct stake in the Nation's business and industrial fertility. Its success and its growth determine whether jobs will exist for people or whether the welfare rolls will be jammed to an even greater extent than they already are.

With America the high cost producer of many of the world's goods, and with other industrial nations making inroads into many of our traditional markets, we have a real challenge confronting us.

It will take more than glib phrases, more than swimming parties, more than leaked statements to the friendly segment of the press to meet this challenge successfully. In short, it will take more than high-sounding conversation to bring it about. If phrasemaking followed by retreat would do it, we would be in good shape right now.

Discerning Democrats and Republicans alike have come to know this and proclaim it. One of the real encouraging signs of our time is the willingness of people to study the issues and vote on the principles rather than put attachment to some party, some bloc, some pressure group ahead of what is right for America to the best of their knowledge and belief. More of this sentiment is needed—but I think we are trending in the right direction.

In the face of such growing awareness, even the New Frontier has been forced to face up to the fact that its grand claims of 1960 about "getting the country moving" have been followed by movement, in the wrong direction.

The question has been asked: "Does the American public want to sail or to anchor down?" About the only thing established by this question is the clear fact that America is clearly at sea.

Two of the biggest factors in this drifting are the Nation's tax policy and its spending policy. The President has finally recognized this to some extent insofar as taxes are concerned, but instead of coming out for real, genuine, far-reaching, comprehensive reforms of the type that can meet a mid-20th century challenge, we have seen proposed a huge deficit for a system already cringing beneath a load far too heavy for it to bear.

This failure to come to grips with the basic tax structure and needed rate reforms together with reduced spending has not gone unnoticed by members of both parties in Congress. Several bills with bipartisan sponsorship have been introduced which clearly head in this direction.

The approach which seems to make the most sense and draw the most interest is a program of gradual tax reduction over a 5-year period that will provide needed relief in all brackets, letting national growth offset each year's reduction coupled with a spending reduction and thereby preserving a balanced budget.

The plans that I endorse will guarantee a reduction of at least 25 percent to every personal taxpayer. This would be evident in the lower brackets by gradually stepping down the lowest bracket from 20 to 15 percent. The rates at all levels would be substantially lower. But 89.4 percent of the total dollar savings would go to middle and lower income people and only 10.5 percent to those with incomes of \$14,000 and over. Here is how it would break down:

Saving to taxpayers in the 0 to \$2,000 level: \$6,754 million, which represents 49.6 percent of the total.

Saving to taxpayers in the \$2,000 to \$14,000 level: \$5,412 million, which represents 39.8 percent of the total.

Saving to taxpayers in the \$14,000 level and above: \$1,447 million, which represents 10.6 percent of the total.

In addition to giving a break to lower income people, this plan will compress the steeply graduated rates of the tax—confiscatory rates that choke off investment capital at its source, rates which suppress initiative and limit the creation of new jobs. It takes an average of \$18,000 of investment now to create one industrial job.

Much concern is evidenced these days when America's growth rates are compared with other industrial nations of the world. It has been reported by our own governmental agencies that 30 percent of Russia's gross national product goes into capital formation—another name for job creation. In 1959, comparable rates in Western Europe were: Germany 23 percent, Austria 23 percent, Italy 21 percent, France 18 percent, and Belgium 17 percent. Our own rate was only 15 percent.

I can state frankly that I do not believe that any government is entitled to take half of the earnings of any man. To accept such an idea is in direct conflict with the universal principle of just compensation for extra effort and achievement. The top rates under proposals already before the Congress would stop at 42 percent.

1963

1199

all, and faithful observance should follow its decrees.

Strong hearts and helpful hands are needed and, fortunately, we have them in every part of our beloved country.

Existing problems demand the thought and quicken the conscience of the country, and the responsibility for their presence, as well as for their righteous settlement, rests upon us all—no more upon me than upon you. There are some national questions in the solution of which patriotism should exclude partisanship. Magnifying their difficulties will not take them off our hands nor facilitate their adjustment, distrust of the capacity, integrity, and high purposes of the American people will not be an inspiring theme for future political contests. Dark pictures and gloomy forebodings are worse than useless. These only becloud, they do not help to point the way of safety and honor. "Hope maketh not ashamed."

The prophets of evil were not the builders of the Republic, nor in its crises since have they saved or served it. The faith of our fathers was a mighty force in its creation, and the faith of their descendants has wrought its progress and furnished its defenders. They are obstructionists who despair, and who would destroy confidence in the ability of our people to solve wisely and for civilization the mighty problems resting upon them.

The American people, intrenched in freedom at home, take their love for it with them wherever they go, and they reject as mistaken and unworthy the doctrine that we lose our own liberties by securing the enduring foundations of liberty to others.

As heretofore, so hereafter will the Nation demonstrate its fitness to administer any new estate which events devolve upon it, and in the fear of God will "take occasion by the hand and make the bounds of freedom wider yet." If there are those among us who would make our way more difficult, we must not be disheartened, but the more earnestly dedicate ourselves to the task upon which we have rightly entered.

The path of progress is seldom smooth. New things are often found hard to do. Our fathers found them so. We find them so. They are inconvenient. They cost us something. But are we not made better for the effort and sacrifice, and are not those we serve lifted up and blessed?

We face at this moment a most important question—that of the future relations of the United States and Cuba.

The peace which we are pledged to leave to the Cuban people must carry with it the guarantees of permanence. We became sponsors for the pacification of the island, and we remain accountable to the Cubans, no less than to our own country and people, for the reconstruction of Cuba as a free commonwealth on abiding foundations of right, justice, liberty, and assured order.

Our enfranchisement of the people will not be completed until free Cuba shall be a reality, not a name; a perfect entity, not a hasty experiment bearing within itself the elements of failure.

(Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to yield in order that I may, as the chairman of the Ohio Republican delegation in the House, express to him, the grandson of a great President from the State of Ohio, the sincere appreciation of our entire delegation for the re-

markable and beautiful tribute that he paid another great Ohio President, a man we all honor and revere, and whose memory will live as long as the State of Ohio lives, William McKinley. You are to be congratulated, sir.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Bill file
U.S. INTELLIGENCE REVISIONS
NEEDED

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the cold war has been underway for some time, and we are now in a position to objectively view several of its aspects. One outstanding fact is obvious to the Nation—the cold war must be waged with weapons of accurate, efficient intelligence methods.

Events of the past point up this fact. The use of the U-2 aerial reconnaissance program gave this Nation a great advantage in determining how to utilize its long-range bombers and missiles. The ill-fated Cuban invasion of 1961 raised some questions of the organization of our intelligence system. Certainly the events of the last half of 1962, when the Soviets launched their wholesale arms buildup in Cuba, has demonstrated that such inequities as time lags in disseminating vital information can seriously impair the security of this Nation.

It has become clear that a review of U.S. intelligence operations is in order for the security of the American people. Such a review should be conducted by the Congress, where constitutional authority for regulating and maintaining the Armed Forces is spelled out in explicit terms. These forces are vital to our Nation's defenses, and in this age of nuclear terror and a precarious balance of power, prompt and accurate intelligence information is just as vital.

For these reasons, I am today introducing legislation to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence. This committee, established in the Congress as a permanent and standing committee, would have jurisdiction over the intelligence activities of the Central Intelligence Agency, the State Department, and the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Its records and proceedings would be highly classified in the interests of national security in order that complete freedom of review could be maintained, and its committee staff would be cleared for such sensitive exposure.

Such a committee was recommended by the Hoover Commission in its report on the study of reorganization of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, when this Nation was formulating the atomic bomb during the closing days of World War II, it was felt that congressional knowledge of this highly classified project was advisable. For this reason, a top secret briefing on the atomic project was held on February 18, 1944, and seven congressional leaders of both Houses were advised of U.S.

efforts in the nuclear field. Two of those distinguished Members are still serving this Nation as Members of this House.

One year later, on February of 1945, those associated with the atomic project briefed five more congressional leaders on the development of this weapon. I know of no better kept secret.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress is justified and well qualified to review this Nation's intelligence efforts. I urge enactment of my proposal to allow this review. The security of America demands it.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 209) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That FRANK J. HORTON, of New York, be, and he is hereby elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on the District of Columbia.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE PASSING OF ROBERT FROST

(Mr. STAFFORD (at the request of Mr. BATTIN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, the people of Vermont particularly regret the passing of Robert Frost. We feel him to be one of our own. He has spent much time in the green mountains of our State. He has been a most distinguished American. We shall miss him. We shall revere his memory.

TAX REFORM

(Mr. SNYDER (at the request of Mr. BATTIN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under a new and clever smokescreen of apparently soaking the rich, the administration now desires to impose greater tax hardships on its middle and lower income taxpayers than at any time in history. It is time for genuine tax reform all right, but one that will restore some balance and fiscal sanity to a situation that is on the verge of getting out of hand.

Based on the Treasury's running balance sheet as of December, every taxpayer would have to shell out \$5,066 to meet his share of the public debt—\$188 more than last year—the Washington World of January 11, 1963.

If every taxpayer had to pay an equal share of taxes to cover New Frontier expenditures for the fiscal year to date, it would amount to \$943 each—or \$77 more than last year.

And this mythical average taxpayer is not as mythical as he might seem. American industrial workers as a rule now fall in the \$4,000 to \$6,000 bracket, with many being above that.

Those who pretend that taxes are aimed only or mostly at the other fel-

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 6

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States and His Excellency, the President of the United States, regarding the lumber industry in the United States

"Whereas there is no shortage of timber for the production of lumber and related items in the United States; and

"Whereas there is a need to increase the cut from overmature forest to prevent excessive loss from decay, disease, and other causes; and

"Whereas U.S. lumber manufacturing firms pay high wages and provide working conditions equal to or better than similar firms in other countries; and

"Whereas lumber manufacturing firms in the United States are losing their home markets to foreign firms, especially Canadian, due to the latter's advantages, including: Depreciated currency, low stumpage rates, noncompetitive bidding, less costly and restrictive forest practices, lower wage rates, high tariff rates on lumber shipped to Canada, low charter rates for coastwise and intercoastal shipping, a cooperative Government; and

"Whereas lumber imports from Canada are increasing yearly at an alarming rate and now constitute about one-sixth of the annual consumption of lumber in the United States; and

"Whereas unemployment in the lumber industry of the United States is increasing with resultant loss of wages to the workers, loss of taxes and income to taxing bodies and communities: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 38th Legislature of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein) do hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States and His Excellency, the President of the United States, to give immediate attention to and request action necessary to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirements that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin, to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of markets, reduction of employment, loss of taxes, and deterioration of communities; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of the Congress, to His Excellency, the President of the United States, and to the Representatives in the Congress from the State of South Dakota.

"NILES A. BOE,
"President of the Senate.
"MILLS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"PAUL E. BROWN,
"Speaker of the House.
"W. J. MATSON,
"Chief Clerk."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

"Resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualification of electors

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska, That the following article proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States by the Congress of the United States through the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 29, 87th Congress, 2d session, is ratified:

"ARTICLE—

"SEC. 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of Alaska shall send a certified copy of this resolution to the Administrator of General Services and direct facsimile copies to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and the members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the senate February 1, 1963.

"FRANK PERATROVICH,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest: "EVELYN K. STEVENSON,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed by the house February 11, 1963.

"BRUCE KENDALL,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest: "PATRICIA R. SLACK,
"Chief Clerk of the Senate.

"Approved by the Governor February 18, 1963.

"WILLIAM A. EGAN,
"Governor of Alaska."

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 1009

"Resolution ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the payment of a poll tax or any other tax as a qualification to voting

"Whereas the House of Representatives of the United States and the U.S. Senate, by the constitutional vote of two-thirds of each House concurring therein, did enact at the 2d session of the 87th Congress of the United States of America in 1962, a proposed amendment of the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas said proposed amendment was submitted to the States for ratification and said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America is in the following words, to wit:

"ARTICLE—

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, or for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll or other tax.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations does hereby ratify the above proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the secretary of State of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Administrator of General Services of the United States."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS AND THE POSTMASTER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES TO PREVENT THE AUTOMATION OF OUTGOING MAIL FROM THE POST OFFICES IN THE CITIES AND TOWNS IN BRISTOL COUNTY

"Whereas on January 22, 1963, outgoing mail from the post offices in the cities and towns of Bristol County will be processed at the automated post office in Providence, R.I.; and

"Whereas this new process will result in a job loss as well as a huge dollar loss to said cities and towns, with no guarantee of improved mail service: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of Massachusetts urgently requests that the Congress of the United States take such action as may be necessary to prevent the automation of outgoing mail in said cities and towns; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Postmaster General of the United States rescind the order providing for the processing of outgoing mail from said post offices in said cities and towns at the automated post office in Providence, R.I.; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Postmaster General, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the house of representatives, February 12, 1963.

"WILLIAM C. MATERS,
"Clerk.

"Attest: "KEVIN F. WHITE,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Hawaii, Hilo, Hawaii, favoring authorization for further and continued work projects and restoration programs in and for the City of Refuge National Historical Park, Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. SYMINGTON, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment:

S. Res. 79. Resolution to authorize a study by the Committee on Armed Services on strategic and critical stockpiling; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments:

S. Res. 75. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to investigate certain matters relating to national defense; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session.

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Manuel F. L. Guerrero of Guam, to be Governor of Guam.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably a total of 465 appointments and promotions of general and flag officers in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. I ask that

these names be printed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Edmondson in the chair). The nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar, as requested by the Senator from West Virginia.

The nominations are as follows:

Lt. Gen. Samuel Leslie Myers, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be placed on the retired list;

Lt. Gen. John Knight Waters, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of general;

Maj. Gen. Theodore John Conway, U.S. Army, and Maj. Gen. Charles Granville Dodge, U.S. Army, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of lieutenants general;

Maj. Gen. Albert Watson II, U.S. Army, and Maj. Gen. Harvey Herman Fischer, U.S. Army, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of lieutenants general;

Robert E. Cushman, Jr., and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Marine Corps;

Brig. Gen. William Joseph Hixson, Jr., and sundry other officers, for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army;

Rear Adm. Kleber S. Masterson, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Naval Weapons in the Department of the Navy;

Edwin S. Miller, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Navy;

Maj. Gen. James C. Jensen (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Regular Air Force;

Rear Adm. George C. Towner, U.S. Navy, to have the grade of vice admiral on the retired list;

Rear Adm. Ephraim P. Holmes, U.S. Navy, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of vice admiral;

Col. Donald J. Campbell, Air Force Reserve, and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Air Force Reserve;

Maj. Gen. William Henry Sterling Wright, U.S. Army, and Maj. Gen. Ben Harrell, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of lieutenant general;

Maj. Gen. George Robinson Mather, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. Alfred Dodd Starbird, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of lieutenant general; and

Francis Stevens Greenleaf, Army National Guard of the United States, for promotion as a Reserve commissioned officer of the Army.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in addition, I report favorably 21,719 nominations in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, in the grade of colonel and below. Since these names have already been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk, for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations will lie on the desk, as re-

quested by the Senator from West Virginia.

The nominations are as follows:

Jimmie M. Anderson, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States;

Thomas C. Fleury, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Army; Harold R. Aaron, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States;

Robert A. Campbell, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Marine Corps;

Raymond L. Abbott, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Air Force;

Gene W. Oehlman, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Air Force; and

Asher D. Abelson, and sundry other Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps candidates, for appointment in the U.S. Navy.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 902. A bill to provide for further research relating to new and improved uses for farm and forest products and for development of new crops, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 903. A bill for the relief of Anna B. Drey-spring; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 904. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not exceeding \$175,000 with which to make a survey of proposed national parkway extensions or connection to Blue Ridge Parkway, Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Foothills Parkway, Mammoth Cave National Park, and Natchez Trace Parkway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 905. A bill for the relief of Jasper Y. Willoughby; and

S. 906. A bill for the relief of Maria Car-raro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG (for himself and Mr. INOUYE):

S. 907. A bill to provide a method for regulating and fixing wage rates for employees of Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard in Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FONG (for himself, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 908. A bill to amend section 305(b) of title 37, United States Code, relating to foreign duty pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 909. A bill for the relief of Mrija Lovsin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 910. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. McNAMARA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. 911. A bill to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 912. A bill approving a compromise and settlement agreement of the Navajo Tribe of Indians and authorizing the tribe to execute and the Secretary of the Interior to approve any oil and gas leases entered into pursuant to the agreement; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 913. A bill for the relief of Anthony F. Bernardo and Ambrose A. Cerrito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 914. A bill to provide compensation to the Crow Tribe of Indians, Montana, for certain lands embraced within the present boundaries of the Crow Indian Reservation, for the validation of titles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. METCALF when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE:

S. 915. A bill to encourage planning and the programing, on a coordinated basis, of land-use projects in the development of metropolitan areas, and to require, after a reasonable preparatory period, the approval by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator of workable programs as a condition to the granting of Federal assistance in the financing of certain projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 916. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth J. Padilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (by request):

S. 917. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. EDMONDSON):

S. 918. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Canton project, Oklahoma, by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONRONEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. MECHEM):

S.J. Res. 49. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a continuing program to reduce nonbeneficial consumptive use of water in the Pecos River Basin, in New Mexico and Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION JOINT COMMITTEE ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

Mr. SMATHERS submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23) to create a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. (See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr.

will be greatly hampered unless we can provide an increased supply of water. Due to drought and the consumption of water by these wasters New Mexico has become indebted in the amount of 60,000 acre-feet to Texas under the provisions of the Pecos River compact. It is hoped that when this project is completed New Mexico will be able to repay its debt with the increased supply of water, and at the same time improve the economy of the entire area dependent upon the Pecos for water.

One thing is certain: Further delay in dealing with this problem will give rise to additional problems and greatly increase the cost of eradication and control work as well as curtail the economic growth of the area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the joint resolution printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 49) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a continuing program to reduce nonbeneficial consumptive use of water in the Pecos River Basin, in New Mexico and Texas, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas for many years there has been an inadequate supply of water for established uses in the Pecos River Basin of New Mexico and Texas; and

Whereas the growth of saltcedar (*tamarix pentandra*) and other undesirable phreatophytes in the Pecos River Basin is responsible for the nonbeneficial consumption of tens of thousands of acre feet of water annually; and

Whereas the prolific growth of saltcedar and other nonbeneficial phreatophytes has progressively intensified the water shortage in the Pecos River Basin; and

Whereas in addition to consuming great quantities of water annually, the growth of such nonbeneficial vegetation also interferes with water flow and canal maintenance, clogs stream channels, and creates flood hazards; and

Whereas many water users that have heretofore entered into repayment contracts for the construction of works are now facing hardships in meeting their financial obligations as a result of the water shortage in the Pecos River Basin; and

Whereas the problem of nonbeneficial consumptive use of water by vegetation has become so severe and widespread that State and local interests are incapable of effectively combating it; and

Whereas there is a continuing need for actions to aid in conversion from nonbeneficial to beneficial use of the water; and

Whereas it is estimated that if such vegetative growth in the Pecos River Basin of New Mexico and Texas is not controlled, such growth will consume practically the entire flow of the Pecos River within the next fifty years: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to prevent further decreases in the supply of water in the Pecos River Basin, and in order to increase and protect such water supply for municipal, industrial, irrigation, and recrea-

tional uses, and for the conservation of fish and wildlife, and to provide protection for the farmlands in such basin from the hazards of floods, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized and directed to take such measures as he deems necessary and appropriate to carry out a continuing program to reduce the nonbeneficial consumption of water in the basin, including that by salt cedar and other undesirable phreatophytes. Such program shall be carried out in the Pecos River Basin from its headwaters in New Mexico to the town of Gilvin, Texas: *Provided, however,* That no money shall be appropriated for and no work commenced on the clearing of the floodway authorized by the Act of February 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 17) unless provision shall have been made to replace any Carlisbad Irrigation District terminal storage which might be lost by the clearing of said floodway.

SEC. 2. As a condition to undertaking the program authorized by the first section of this joint resolution, the Secretary shall require the States of New Mexico and Texas to give such assurances as he deems adequate that such States will acquire such lands, easements, rights-of-way, and other interests in lands as the Secretary considers necessary effectively to carry out such program.

SEC. 3. (a) As a further condition to undertaking the program authorized by this joint resolution, the Secretary may, with respect to those beneficiaries in New Mexico and Texas which the Secretary determines to be likely to benefit directly from the results of such program, require such commitments as he deems appropriate that such beneficiaries will repay the United States so much of the reimbursable costs incurred by it in carrying out such program as do not exceed the value of the benefits accruing to such beneficiaries from such program. The Secretary shall not require the repayment of such costs unless he determines that it is feasible (1) to identify the beneficiaries that are directly benefited by the program, and (2) to measure the extent to which each beneficiary is benefited by such program.

(b) Repayment contracts entered into pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, except that the amount of the repayment installment in the case of any beneficiary shall be fixed by the Secretary in accordance with the ability of such beneficiary to pay, taking into consideration all other financial obligations of such beneficiary.

(c) Any costs of the program which the Secretary determines should be assigned to flood control, recreation, or restoration of stream flow shall not be included in computing the costs properly allocable to the beneficiaries under this section; but shall be considered as nonreimbursable costs.

SEC. 4. Nothing contained in this joint resolution shall be construed to abrogate, amend, modify, or be in conflict with any provisions of the Pecos River compact.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, just a few days ago I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks made by the very able and distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] with respect to certain activities engaged in by the Central Intelligence Agency, and their

impact on U.S. security and foreign policy.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon expressed the view that this Agency should be under a measure of congressional control. This is a view I share with him, and, have been of such a mind for a long time.

As far back as the 1st session of the 84th Congress, in 1955, I cosponsored a concurrent resolution introduced by the now majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] to create a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence, similar to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, because, I, too, believed that no agency of the Government spending taxpayers' funds should be free to do as it pleases without the Congress maintaining its proper measure of control.

There has been criticism about the Central Intelligence Agency over the years concerning its activities and its failure to make any report to the Congress. It should not necessarily be placed under congressional control, but it should periodically be subjected to congressional scrutiny.

We all realize this Agency annually spends approximately \$1 billion. There have been, and will be, those who say this Agency's activities are so secret—no one should know—the interests of national security. However, this is not a valid argument.

No harm was done from the standpoint of security or in maintaining secrecy in connection with the development of the atomic bomb. A joint congressional committee of the Congress certainly maintained this secret, while at the same time it promoted the best interests of the Nation in maintaining a watchdog setup over the Atomic Energy Commission.

I feel as many other Members of Congress that there should be a congressional watchdog committee to look over the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency. I think it is in the public interest that such a committee be appointed.

To achieve this objective, I am submitting at this time a concurrent resolution which would establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence, to be composed of six Members of the Senate and six Members of the House of Representatives; not more than four Members appointed from either the Senate or the House shall be of the same political party.

The measure provides that the committee would make continuing studies of the activities of this Agency and the problems relating to the gathering of intelligence affecting the national security, and of its coordination and utilization by the various departments, agencies and instrumentalities of the Government.

In turn, the Central Intelligence Agency would be required to keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to all of its activities.

I sincerely trust that the committee to which this resolution is referred will take prompt and favorable action on it.

Mr. President, I ask that the resolution remain at the desk for a period of 3 days so that any of my colleagues who would

portant subject in detail in testimony on the bill.

Enclosed also are a section-by-section summary of the bill and an outline of its major features.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 917) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CANTON RESERVOIR PROJECT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the construction of the Canton project in Oklahoma.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement relating to that project be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 918) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Canton project, Oklahoma, by the Secretary of the Interior, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. EDMONDSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The statement presented by Mr. MONRONEY is as follows:

CANTON PROJECT

The Canton Reservoir project was authorized in 1938. Construction was started in 1940, was interrupted by the war, and the project completed in 1948. At the time the project was authorized, it was estimated to cost \$12,300,000. It actually was completed for \$10,300,000, or \$2 million less than the estimate.

When the project was planned, the Corps of Engineers recognized the necessity of including conservation storage for irrigation and, as a result of negotiations of the Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board, not only was 100,000 acre-feet of storage, above the flood control requirements, added to the project but the outlet works for release of irrigation water were built into the dam.

A paragraph from the House document, used as a basis of authorization of the project states: "Further analysis in connection with the maximum utilization of the stream flow with respect to its conservation at Canton by storage indicates that the practical efficient limit for this purpose is 100,000 acre-feet. Storage in this amount would insure an annual supply of 156,000 acre-feet needed for domestic use, dilution purposes, and irrigation or other uses."

The Bureau of Reclamation Project report of June 22, 1954 (H. Doc. 445, 83d Cong., 2d sess.) recommends the irrigation of 16,000 acres below the Canton Dam, and using the conservation storage for the project lands. The irrigation project is estimated at about \$4,500,000, consisting of the main canals, laterals, and necessary drainage works. The

annual charges would be about \$72,000 for 70 years. Of the 16,000 acres almost one-third is Indian owned. The benefit-cost ratio is 2 to 1.

The Canton Dam, as operated by the Corps of Engineers since its completion in 1948, has reduced flood damages by about \$5 million. Other income from the project has been \$125,000 from leasing of lands, and over \$1,900,000 from leasing of storage space for municipal water supply. Thus, the Federal investment has paid more than 5½ percent per year. Add the return that will come from irrigation and it is easy to see that the annual return may reach 7½ or 8 percent.

In every Congress since 1946, bills have been introduced to bring the irrigation benefits nearer to reality. First there were bills to legislate the necessary storage in the Canton Reservoir, and 69,000 acre-feet of storage has so been designated. Still there remains the job of getting the irrigation project authorized.

The local people are to be commended for their long and determined efforts on this project. Less determined people would have given up years ago, but not so with these. They have cooperated fully with the State and Federal agencies to remove roadblocks.

There was the matter of securing the court adjudication of the water rights, which was completed in the District Court of Oklahoma County in December 1949.

There was the formation of the Canton Irrigation District by an overwhelming vote of the irrigation landowners on December, 15, 1945.

There was the job of getting the Bureau of Reclamation Survey Report to Congress. This was finally accomplished in 1953.

There were negotiations with the Indian Service relating to the 30 percent Indian-owned land in the project, and the tedious task of working out water supply problems with Oklahoma City and Enid.

All of this required leadership of the first order.

The job is not complete. The "climate" in Washington has improved.

Budget A47 with which we wrestled for years has been scuttled, and a more realistic approach has been adopted by this administration. The President in his budget message has said:

"Natural resources development is a key requisite to the present and future economic growth of the Nation.

"Land, water, and power resources: Most of these expenditures will be to continue construction of projects for flood control, navigation, irrigation, water supply, and hydroelectric power. Related developments of recreational facilities and fish and wildlife resources will be carried forward. These projects represent investments which will yield benefits for years to come.

"With funds requested for 1964 the Corps of Engineers will initiate construction of 32 projects, the Bureau of Reclamation 8 new projects, and the Tennessee Valley Authority 2 new projects."

Here is the new view. We should build such projects as Canton. It fits into the pattern of developing our basic natural resources.

In the President's request for funds is an item of \$200,000 for advance engineering and design for the Optima project on the North Canadian River upstream from Canton Reservoir. This project will provide 260,000 additional acre-feet of capacity which should insure the availability of 100,000 acre-feet of storage capacity for irrigation of 16,000 acres of land below Canton. At the same time no adverse effect will be had on flood control and water supply.

With these new developments, I am hopeful for favorable consideration and authorization of the Canton irrigation project as recommended in the bill I am introducing.

PROGRAM TO REDUCE NONBENEFICIAL CONSUMPTIVE USE OF WATER, PECOS RIVER BASIN, NEW MEXICO AND TEXAS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to provide authority to the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a continuing program to reduce nonbeneficial consumptive uses of water in the Pecos River Basin in New Mexico and Texas.

I am sure the Members of the Senate are well aware of the importance of water in the arid regions of the western part of the United States. The studies of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources have shown that water shortage and water quality are not only a problem of the West but are becoming major problems elsewhere. We must therefore use every practical means at our command to solve these problems as quickly as possible if we are to provide water for irrigation, industrial, and domestic uses and for recreation purposes to meet the demands of the population.

We have in the Southwest a menace in the form of certain phreatophytes that is consuming nonbeneficially each year over 25 million acre-feet of our water. The principal culprit is a plant known as Tamarix gallica, more commonly known as saltcedar. These plants were introduced into the United States from the Mediterranean region, east Asia, or India, where they are indigenous. The climate and other conditions of the West are ideal for the rapid growth of this plant and since 1914 it has spread to nearly all of the streambeds of the West and is spreading rapidly and now covers nearly 15 million acres of bottomlands in the 17 Western States.

We have initiated, through the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers, a program on the Rio Grande above Elephant Butte Lake to remove some of these saltcedar and to build a floodway and channel into the lake. This project was started 11 years ago and during construction, up until 1961, has saved 550,000 acre-feet. The Bureau of Reclamation states that beginning this year they expect to save 100,000 acre-feet annually for Elephant Butte Reservoir. This project has already demonstrated that this type of water salvage work is profitable.

The Pecos River Basin is one of the most heavily infested river basins in the West. From 600 acres found in the McMillan Delta in 1915, the infested area has grown to 43,000 acres in 1957 and is well over that amount now. The National Resources Planning Board reported that the saltcedar in this area is consuming approximately 5 acre-feet of water per acre annually. According to the U.S. Geological Survey, these phreatophytes could consume virtually the entire flow of the Pecos River in this area in 50 years if the growth goes unreined.

Some of New Mexico's chief farming and population centers lie in the Pecos Valley. The economic growth of this area and the Red Bluff area in Texas

1963

like to join with me as cosponsors may do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Florida.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence to be composed of six Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and six Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Of the six members to be appointed from the Senate, three shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and three shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate. Of the six members to be appointed from the House of Representatives, three shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and three shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives. Not more than four members appointed from either the Senate or the House of Representatives shall be from the same political party.

SEC. 2. (a) The joint committee shall make continuing studies of the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency and of problems relating to the gathering of intelligence affecting the national security and of its coordination and utilization by the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government. The Central Intelligence Agency shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to its activities. All bills, resolutions, and other matters in the Senate or the House of Representatives relating primarily to the Central Intelligence Agency shall be referred to the joint committee.

(b) The members of the joint committee who are Members of the Senate shall from time to time report to the Senate, and the members of the joint committee who are Members of the House of Representatives shall from time to time report to the House, by bill or otherwise, their recommendations with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of their respective Houses which are (1) referred to the joint committee, or (2) otherwise within the jurisdiction of the joint committee.

SEC. 3. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 4. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report public hearings shall not be in excess of the amounts prescribed by law for reporting the hearings of standing committees of the Senate. The cost of such services to report ex-

ecutive hearings shall be fixed at an equitable rate by the joint committee.

SEC. 5. The joint committee is empowered to appoint such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government.

SEC. 6. The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

DUTIES ON IMPORTS OF CATTLE, BEEF, AND VEAL—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] be added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 557) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose additional duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year in excess of annual quotas, introduced by me, for myself and other Senators, on January 28, 1963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when there is a reprinting of the bill S. 558 and the Senate Joint Resolution, S.J. Res. 30, which deal with our educational and cultural exchange programs, and which I introduced on January 28 of this year, that the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] be added as a cosponsor. During the last meeting of the NATO parliamentary conference in Paris last November the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and I served as members of the American delegation to the NATO parliamentary committee dealing with education and cultural exchange programs. The Senator from West Virginia made some very valuable contributions during the NATO conference. He saw these bills in the Record. I did not confer with anyone before introducing them. The Senator from West Virginia would like to become a cosponsor, and I would be honored and happy to have him join me as a cosponsor of the measures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROHIBITION OF USE OF MEASURING DEVICES IN POSTAL SERVICE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent

that the name of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] may be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 799) to prevent the use of stopwatches, work measurement programs, or other performance standards operations as measuring devices in the postal service, introduced by me on February 6, 1963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the names of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FREWSTER] be added as cosponsors to the bill S. 736, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of treatment works to control water and air pollution by permitting the deduction of expenditures for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of such treatment works, and to the bill S. 737, to promote water and air pollution control and abatement by authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide certain assistance to small business concerns in obtaining necessary treatment works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMISSION ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] be added as a cosponsor to the bill (S. 816) providing for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology, submitted by me on February 18, 1963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I welcome the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut as a cosponsor. We are delighted to have his support and are glad to have him identified with this effort to secure legislation.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of February 11, 1963:

S. 774. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguished brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes: Mr. INOUYE, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. RANDOLPH.

Authority of February 20, 1963:

S. 869. A bill to authorize the burial of certain news correspondents in national cemeteries: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. LONG of Missouri, and Mr. MOSS.

Authority of February 21, 1963:

S. 880. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital

February 25

and related services to aged beneficiaries: Mr. BAYH, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. NELSON.

THE WILDERNESS BILL—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 20, 1963, the names of Senators BARTLETT, BENNETT, CANNON, DOMINICK, FONG, GOLDWATER, HAYDEN, JORDAN of Idaho, LAUSCHE, MECHEM, MUNDT, RANDOLPH, SIMPSON, and THURMOND were added as additional cosponsors of the amendment submitted by Mr. ALLOTT on February 20, 1963, to the bill (S. 4) to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert M. Morgenthau, of New York, to be U.S. attorney, southern district of New York, for a term of 4 years—recess appointment.

Homer Lester Benson, of Indiana, to be a member of the Board of Parole for term expiring September 30, 1968—recess appointment.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Monday, March 4, 1963, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, March 5, 1963, beginning at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the following nominations:

William J. Nealon, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge, middle district of Pennsylvania—recess appointment.

Carl E. McGowan, of Illinois, to be U.S. circuit judge, District of Columbia circuit, vice Henry W. Edgerton, retiring.

H. Vearle Payne, of New Mexico, to be U.S. district judge, district of New Mexico, vice Carl A. Hatch, retiring.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Washington's Birthday address by Senator STEWART, delivered on February 22, 1963, at Richmond, Va., together with the introduction by Senator ROBERTSON.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

Sermon delivered in Washington Cathedral by the Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, Jr., dean, on the need to relate our faith to the problems of a changing world.

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

Editorial entitled "It's Worth a Try," published in the Springfield (Mo.) Leader-Press of February 1, 1963, relating to the administration's farm program.

Article entitled "Surveying for Peace," written by Mildred Hall, associate editor of National Surveyor, and published in the January 1963 issue of that periodical.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Editorial published in the Arkansas Gazette relating to the promotion of former Gov. Sid McMath, of Arkansas, to the rank of brigadier general in the Marine Corps Reserve.

By Mr. CASE:

Article from National Educational Television News Quarterly for the fall of 1962, dealing with educational television programs.

Article entitled "Adventures With Space," written by Firman E. Baer, professor emeritus of agricultural chemistry in the College of Agriculture of Rutgers University, and published in the Rutgers Alumni Monthly, describing his views on the problem of diminishing open land areas in this country, with special attention to land falling to industrial and urban development.

Article entitled "Disease Fighter—Jersey Veterinarian Pioneered Poultry Research," published in the Newark (N.J.) Sunday News magazine of recent date.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

Article entitled "Blind Girl, 23, Starts Duty With Peace Corps," published in the Washington Evening Star of February 20, 1963, being a tribute to Marilyn Brandt, of San Antonio, Tex., a blind girl recently appointed to the Peace Corps.

VISIT BY THE KING OF LAOS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the President and the people of the United States today have the honor of greeting the King of Laos, his Majesty Sri Savang Vatthana. It has been my privilege to know the King of Laos for over a decade, and, I believe, to understand and appreciate the difficulties and the complex problems which have been his, and, quite likely, will continue to confront him in the years ahead.

He is fully aware of the difficulties which face Laos, and is prepared to serve as a catalyst to help solve them. With his dignity, prestige, knowledge, and understanding, he is extremely well qualified to preside over a reunification of his country and to attend to the needs and the wants of his people.

We are indeed happy to have him as our guest, Mr. President; and, on behalf of the Senate of the United States, I

extend to him our greetings, our cordial best wishes, and our hope that the friendship between our two countries will continue on the basis of mutual cordiality and understanding, and that the future of Laos will be enhanced and strengthened as a free, independent, and wholly sovereign nation.

FOURTEENTH ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL PANCAKE DAY RACE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the 14th annual International Pancake Day Race will be run tomorrow. This great good-will event between the housewives of Liberal, Kans., and Olney, England, is always held on the Tuesday before Ash Wednesday.

This race is sponsored by the junior chamber of commerce of Liberal, for the promotion of international relations between England and the United States. It is based on competition between the young ladies of Olney, England, and the young ladies of Liberal, Kans.

Some years ago the people of Liberal heard of this 500-year event of pancake racing over a 415-yard course from the town pump to the church. The city of Liberal challenged the women of Olney, England, to this race; and the challenge was accepted by Rev. R. C. Collins, the Vicar of Olney.

In old England, it was customary for the housewives to drop whatever they were doing and hurry to the church at the tolling of the bell, to be "shriven" of their sins. In 1445, a wife in Olney, England, started baking her pancakes rather late. They were not quite finished when the church bell rang; but she hurried off to the "shriving," carrying her griddle and pancakes with her. Thus, an annual sporting event was born.

I am inviting the Members of the U.S. Senate and their staffs, the Kansas congressional delegation, and the press to be my guests tomorrow morning, for breakfast in the Senate dining rooms, here in the Capitol, where they will be served the finest pancakes in the world, made from the finest flour in the world, furnished by the Liberal Junior Chamber of Commerce, directly from the "Pancake Hub of the Universe."

Mrs. Vicki Campbell, a Liberal, Kans., housewife and mother of two young children, is in Washington, to help with this breakfast. Mrs. Campbell won the Liberal Pancake Race last year, and is here representing the Liberal Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate and be made the pending business.

2926

cies. Where else but in the Congress, with legislative and appropriation review, can the entire spread of the U.S. Government be better coordinated and evaluated. And where else but in the Congress can the will of the American people be more directly interpreted?

Although CIA is subjected to some review each year when its budget is examined annually by the Bureau of the Budget and the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress, such review can only provide hindsight—not daily checks or recommendations as they might be needed.

Mr. Dulles fears that congressional review of the CIA would produce security leaks and thereby destroy the effectiveness of the agency. If this were true, why is classified material now made available to congressional leaders by the President? Members of Congress are regularly given highly sensitive intelligence data pertaining to foreign affairs and defense matters, and the Nation's security is not jeopardized in the least. On the contrary, this Nation's well-being is enhanced when executive sessions are held by the congressional committees having jurisdiction in the military and international fields.

And Congress can keep a secret. When the United States was developing the atomic bomb during the closing days of World War II, it was felt that the Congress was entitled to know about the project. A top secret briefing was held on February 18, 1944, and seven congressional leaders of both Houses were advised of U.S. efforts in the nuclear field. Two of those distinguished leaders are still serving this Nation as Members of this House.

One year later, on February of 1945, five more congressional leaders were briefed on the development of atomic weapons.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no better kept secret.

The evidence of recent months shows that the CIA might not be the instrument it was designed to be. The U-2 incident of the Eisenhower administration caused serious implications in our foreign policy. The Bay of Pigs fiasco as well as the collection of intelligence data surrounding Cuba suggests there may well be some serious kinks in our intelligence system.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, the Central Intelligence Agency is once again involved in a new controversy respecting our foreign operations. How do we know the operations of this agency? What evidence is there to show that the agency's personnel is not delinquent in effecting a smooth transmission of vital intelligence data? And what proof have we that this agency, which in many respects has the power to preempt foreign policy, is not actually exercising this power through practices which are contradictory to the established policy objectives of this Government?

Mr. Speaker, in these days when the Nation is engaged in a struggle for its very survival, Americans and particularly the Congress, would do well to ask some searching questions about this supersecret organization. Such ques-

tions could be answered in the review provided by the Joint Committee as proposed in my bill, House Joint Resolution 211.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Florida on the excellent job he has done in exposing some of the situation that has been going on down in Cuba and for bringing out the information about the fact missiles were not discovered until after the CIA was taken off the particular project.

Could the gentleman tell me from whence the information came that there were 42 medium or intermediate range missiles in Cuba?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Actually, I think these reports were made by the Defense Department to the State Department.

Mr. STINSON. Is it not true that this information originally came from Khrushchev that there were 42 missiles, because we have no checks that might possibly be gathered in Cuba while CIA was in charge of the project?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I think we do have some reports from the exile groups that first started out checking the missiles. As to the exact number, I am not sure where the first reports came from, but it is my impression they have been verified in statements by our own Government.

Mr. STINSON. To my knowledge, and perhaps the gentleman can amplify this a little bit, there never has been any actual identification that there were 42 missiles brought into Cuba. We have not seen them. We do not know that there were 42 brought into Cuba.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. That could well be. We will not know the true story until we have on-site inspection.

Mr. STINSON. This information that 42 were there was actually received from Mr. Khrushchev, who has proven to be extremely unreliable in relaying information to the United States.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I appreciate the point that the gentleman makes, but I think too we have had some verification from our own intelligence sources, including some of the exile groups. They have forwarded many of those reports. I have received some. I have turned these over to our Government agencies for checkout. It is a problem that cannot possibly be solved until we have some on-site inspection.

OVERCROWDED RAIL COACHES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to call to the attention of the Members of the House an omission in the Interstate Commerce Act relative to the transportation of passengers on railroad coaches in interstate commerce. This matter was brought to my attention indirectly as a result of an ex-

perience I personally encountered at 30th Street Station in Philadelphia on the evening of February 24, 1963. On that occasion a train operated by the Pennsylvania Railroad between New York and Washington stopped as scheduled in Philadelphia. The train consisted of some 13 railway coaches in addition to a diner and a forth. When the train stopped the crew notified the several hundred passengers waiting to board the train at 30th Street Station that no seats were available and my personal investigation indicated to me that this condition prevailed from the time the train departed from New York. As a result of this announcement there was a mad rush of several hundred passengers and great danger of serious personal injury, particularly to many older passengers was created. No effort was made by the crew of this particular train to limit the number of passengers boarding the coaches and I personally observed several coaches that were so crowded that no one could move in the aisles. A very dangerous hazard was thereby permitted to exist by the railroad. I have in the past personally sympathized with the plight of the railroads, recognizing as I do the problems confronting them. I now think, however, that a great deal of their problems are of their own doing and that the service for passengers between Washington and New York is a good illustration of the failure of railroad management. I have personally observed the deterioration of this service during my 5 years in the Congress.

I find the coaches are many times unkempt, the service often is discourteous and the equipment used by the railroads is generally of ancient vintage. The passengers who boarded this particular train in Philadelphia were charged a fare for a seat by the railroad and then were herded like a bunch of cattle into overcrowded coaches and forced to stand for approximately 2 hours. The management of the railroad with the knowledge that no seats were available from the time the train left New York made no provisions for any additional sections on this train and made no announcement to the passengers awaiting the train in Philadelphia of the unavailability of seats. Recognizing the dangers inherent with the overcrowding of railroad coaches, I contacted a representative of the Interstate Commerce Commission for the purpose of determining what regulation covered the number of passengers riding in railroad coaches in interstate commerce. I was informed that the Interstate Commerce Commission had no authority under the law to issue any such regulation. As of now, therefore, the railroads have the perfect right to carry as many standees in a railroad coach as they wish without regard to the safety of the passengers. The railroads, particularly the Pennsylvania, have been doing this for some time. I am convinced that the safety and welfare of the citizens of this country demand that some limitation be placed upon the number of passengers riding in these railroad coaches and I have, therefore, prepared and have today introduced a bill grant-

since any and all section 22 rate quotations are automatically within the law, the courts cannot very well hand down a decision against a defendant when there has been no violation. Such is the incongruity of section 22. It is a law against the law and yet exempt from all laws.

Finally, I want to point out that the provisions of the bill would not apply if the President or the head of any agency or department certifies in writing to the Commission that the disclosure of information with respect to section 22 rates would endanger the national security.

Mr. Speaker, the weakened condition of our national transportation system is a matter of grave concern to all of us. It is plain that a major contributing factor of ever-growing proportions is the failure of carriers to offer—and failure of the Government to insist upon—comparative section 22 rates. No budgetary purpose is served by this practice—quite the contrary—and we know from experience that it only promotes ruinous competition which inhibits modernization of equipment and otherwise helps to destroy the common carrier system.

For the Government to have played this ignominious role as long as it has is little short of a national disgrace. We cannot allow congressional inaction to further the destructive process.

Mr. Speaker, I ask prompt committee consideration of the bill I have offered and urge its support by my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

URGENT NEED FOR CONGRESSIONAL JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE AGENCIES OF GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, particularly disturbing are the reports that no conclusive photographs of Soviet intermediate range ballistic missiles in Cuba were made available to the President until the task of aerial reconnaissance was transferred from CIA to the Air Force. In its March 4 issue published this week, Newsweek magazine states that Presidential Security Adviser McGeorge Bundy transferred responsibility for these flights from CIA to the Strategic Air Command. Newsweek then states that the very first flight thereafter produced the evidence that triggered the face-down crisis of last October. Mr. Speaker, the implication clearly exists that CIA may have been the stopgap which accounted for the timelag of some 2 weeks in which the Russians almost completed their missile installation.

In addition, the Central Intelligence Agency has also caught the public eye with the recent statements of former Director Allen Dulles. In his remarks, Mr. Dulles said that the Kremlin had raised the art of espionage to an unprec-

edented height, and for that reason CIA should be exempt from any continuing congressional scrutiny. In short, Mr. Dulles argues, CIA should be left alone to continue its unparalleled role as the Nation's No. 1 untouchable Government agency.

It may be argued that the secretiveness of the CIA precludes the possibility of its successes coming to light; that its nature does not allow its ratio of success versus failure to be known. However, responsible Americans have begun to view the CIA differently. The Hoover Commission recommended that a congressional committee be set up to oversee the CIA. I have introduced legislation to establish such a committee—House Joint Resolution 211. And just last week, two of the Nation's leading newspapers, the Washington Post and the Evening Star, both editorially voiced their concern over the supersecret agency and, under unanimous consent, I include those editorials in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 20, 1963]

CONGRESS AND THE CIA

As a former director of the organization, Allen Dulles writes with authority in his article declaring that there should be no further congressional curbs on the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency. This supersecret enterprise, of course, embraces some of our Government's most delicate and most dangerous operations, and it therefore bears vitally on the security of the Nation. That is why Mr. Dulles argues that it must be exempted from controls normally exercised by either the House or the Senate, or both working together in the form of a joint committee. As he has put it, "we are faced by an antagonist [the Kremlin] that has raised the art of espionage to an unprecedented height," and in such circumstances there is need to put a bridle on the American inclination "to talk too much about matters that should be classified."

These matters, according to Mr. Dulles, most certainly include the CIA's operations, which could be greatly hampered—and perhaps washed out altogether—if subjected to constant congressional gossip, scrutiny and badgering of a sort that could let out all the secrets. This strikes us as a solid point, but Democratic Senator Morse, of Oregon, has firm views to the contrary. He believes that the CIA exercises police-state powers that should be taken away from it forthwith, and he intends to speak at length on the issue in the next week or so. The event will be awaited with interest, especially in view of the Senator's formidable capacity to speak at length. Meanwhile, it must be hoped that there will be no politicking in this exceedingly sensitive area.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 20, 1963]

CHECKING INTELLIGENCE

The opinion of Allen Dulles, former Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, that there is no need for more controls on this country's intelligence effort, carries a great deal of weight, because of his personal integrity and his long professional experience. Nevertheless, his exhaustive and capable discussion of the work of the CIA, in the Encyclopedia Britannica, will not eliminate anxiety about the role of the Agency. It is true that the CIA operates under the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of State, and that its work is under the scrutiny of the President's Board of Consultants on Foreign Intelligence Activities

which meets several times a year, and that its appropriations pass through the Budget Bureau and the congressional Appropriations Committees. None of these devices provides a day-to-day check on operations and all of them together have not been sufficient to prevent CIA operations at cross-purposes with those of persons supposed to be carrying out American policy abroad.

There have been instances in Egypt, in southeast Asia, in South America, and even in Europe, in which such conflicts have been exhibited. Ambassadors have been hindered and embarrassed by the spooks who have been attached in times past to their Embassies but who have operated almost entirely outside their direction.

Nor is it completely reassuring to say that CIA agents never get involved in policy. The decision to seek information by clandestine means often is, in itself, a policy decision. The failures of intelligence gathering operations sometimes shape policy itself, in wholly unplanned ways. The U-2 episode in the Soviet Union is only the most dramatic illustration of the impact of intelligence activities on policy. And even where the primary intelligence mission is successful—diplomatic risks and costs are involved that may be disproportionate to the intelligence gain.

The congressional watchdog committee recommended by the Hoover Commission was decisively rejected by Congress in 1956 and it may not be the answer now. The other checks enumerated by Mr. Dulles, are not the whole answer, either. The President and members of his Cabinet can give only infrequent and crisis attention to the task. The Budget Bureau can give fund allocation close scrutiny but it is hardly in position to criticize actual field operations, or even to criticize appropriations when its experts turn out to be former CIA officials. The appropriation procedures of Congress afford no administrative control of day-to-day enterprises.

No objective person could read Mr. Dulles' formidable defense of the CIA without acquiring the conviction that the organization is of the greatest importance to the country's survival. Many will be convinced that it is so important that it cannot be left to carry out espionage, subversion and information functions all over the world without more continuous direction from the very highest level of the Government apparatus.

Mr. Speaker, truth does exist in Mr. Dulles' statement that the Kremlin is an accomplished antagonist. An agency charged with the operations such as those conducted by the CIA is vital to the security and tactics of America if we are to be successful in the cold war. However, the advantages of the CIA being exempt from continuing scrutiny of a permanent joint congressional committee are far outweighed by the disadvantages.

What happens, for example, when any Government bureau is allowed to go unchecked? The lack of congressional review results in inefficiency, needless and many times wasteful expenditures, as well as the pursuit of policies which may be completely contrary to national goals. If the principle of congressional review were not extended to every U.S. Government agency think of the uncoordinated duplication and damage which would result to this Nation. Consider as well the benefits which have accrued to America by a free press questioning the unclassified actions of the U.S. Government.

It is for the benefit of the Nation that Congress does police Government agen-

tutes should be authorized to include the teaching of English.

Finally, there should be increased use of existing legislative authority for exchanges of faculty members with foreign countries and for grants to actual and prospective college teachers to study abroad. The Council believes that Federal agencies administering these programs should consult with the academic community in developing fresh approaches that will win support for needed and substantial increases in appropriations for international educational exchanges.

III. Students

There is need for appropriate Federal action to lower the financial barriers to higher education for qualified students.

The predicted enrollment increase of 2.8 million students between 1962-63 and 1970-71 places a high priority on the need for academic facilities and college teachers. Realization that enrollments will rise by one-fourth between 1962 and 1965 alone emphasizes the urgency of this need. Without adequate facilities and qualified teachers, our colleges and universities will have to resort to expedients detrimental to educational quality. Thus the Council believes first priority should go to Federal programs designed to assure the coming generation of college students of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries in which to learn, and qualified persons to teach them.

All evidence indicates that charges to students for tuition, fees, and room and board in both public and private institutions are continuing to rise sharply. This upward trend in costs has forced the student, his family, and the institution to plan more realistically the share of the cost that should be borne by grant assistance, loans, and student employment. But dangers lie ahead, since a study of trends also indicates that scholarships and institutional loan funds, even when augmented by Federal loan funds available under the National Defense Education Act, are not keeping pace either with the increase in number of students or with the upward cost trend. Furthermore, while the loan program of the National Defense Education Act has helped many families in the middle-income brackets, qualified students from the very low income levels are finding it more and more difficult to finance a college education.³

With National Defense Education Act assistance, State programs of testing and counseling, with special emphasis on early identification of talented students, have either been initiated or expanded. But it is not enough to identify the talented student who comes from a low-income family unless some hope of grant assistance can be offered by the time he must make the decision to go to college. In short, if equality of educational opportunity is to be more than an abstract slogan, the Federal Government must help colleges and universities provide grant assistance as well as loan assistance to able but needy students.

Student loans: The ceiling of \$250,000 on Federal contributions to any one institutional loan fund should be removed so that institutions may request funds in proportion to the predictable demand for them. The National Defense Education Act student loan program should be made a permanent program, with the Federal capital contributions granted to the institutions as permanent revolving loan funds. From time to time additional appropriations should then be made for grants to institutions to reimburse them for the portion of loans forgiven for recipi-

ents who entered teaching, to meet the needs resulting from increasing enrollments, and to establish loan funds for institutions new to the program.

As a matter of equity to student borrowers, the 50 percent "forgiveness" of loans should be extended to all teaching, including college teaching in recognized public and private, nonprofit institutions of education.

Student grant assistance: With due regard to the priority needs for a Federal program of assistance for construction of academic facilities and for expansion of the National Defense Education Act fellowship program for training college teachers, a new Federal program of 4-year undergraduate scholarships should be provided to supplement the National Defense Education Act student loan program. This scholarship or grant assistance program should have as its primary objective the seeking out and assisting of students of academic promise and great financial need.

International student exchanges: In the Mutual Education and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, Congress recognized the need to increase the number of undergraduate and graduate student exchanges with foreign countries and to provide special services to foreign students enrolled in American colleges and universities. Congress should appropriate adequate funds to support these programs realistically if international exchanges of students are to be extended effectively to emerging nations, and if the foreign student is to obtain maximum benefit from study in an American institution.

IV. Other proposals and considerations

The focus of Federal action to sustain and develop American higher education as a national resource must be on programs to assist institutions to meet the demand for better higher education for an increasing number of students. Thus the construction of academic facilities and the recruitment and preparation of qualified college teachers must have first priority for the academic community, and should have first priority in the thinking of Congress and the executive. The need for more student financial assistance holds a second priority.

The Council will continue to support other proposals for Federal action in the field of higher education. The list below is by no means inclusive, but among the proposals for which the Council intends to provide appropriate support are these:

Federal assistance for construction of teaching facilities in medicine, dentistry, and other health professions.

Payment of full costs of federally sponsored research.

Equitable reimbursement to colleges and universities for expenses incurred in providing facilities and instruction for ROTC units.

Federal assistance to programs for college-level technician education.

Extension of the urban renewal program with annual authorizations sufficient to maintain benefits to the colleges and universities at least at current levels.

Amendments to the National Defense Education Act (a) to authorize preparation of persons to teach English as a second language, (b) to permit institutions and agencies undertaking National Defense Education Act-supported research to publish the results of such research, and (c) to authorize guidance institutes for training college student personnel workers.

Implementation of international agreements providing for tariff-free importation of books and scientific equipment.

Appropriations for Federal educational programs commensurate with the known demands for such programs. Particular emphasis will be placed on adequate appropriations for the salaries and expenses of

the Office of Education, for the program of the National Defense Education Act, for the National Science Foundation for grants in support of educational research, and for international educational exchanges.

In the interest of providing better coordination and focus for Federal programs in support of education, the American Council on Education believes there should be appropriate revision of Federal organization and administration to strengthen the U.S. Office of Education, and to bring the U.S. Commissioner of Education into a closer relationship with the President.

In addition the Council is convinced that the Federal Government has an immediate responsibility to assess all of its present relationships with higher education and to take such steps as may be necessary to make these relationships more conducive to the long-term strengthening of the Nation's educational resources. In such an endeavor the Council pledges its full cooperation and assistance.

The Urgent Need for Decision

On December 15, 1962, President Logan Wilson of the American Council wrote the President of the United States:

"The crisis long predicted in the capacity of our institutions to meet the demands upon them is no longer something in the future. It is now."

It takes time to enact new Federal legislation and then to get it into effective operation. It also takes time to plan and then to build new buildings, and to complete the graduate education of a college teacher. Prompt action in the 1st session of the 88th Congress might result in a few new instructional buildings ready for use in the middle of the academic year 1963-64 and many more ready for use at the beginning of the 1964-65 academic year. The full effect, however, of a new Federal program for construction of academic facilities would not be felt until 1965-66 and beyond.

Similarly, assuming that Congress acts promptly in its 1963 session, expanded graduate programs for training college teachers would not make a significant difference in the supply of college teachers until 1965 and after.

The crisis cannot be averted, but it can be met without resorting to hastily devised "crash" programs. The decision lies both with Congress and with the President and his advisers. The American Council on Education is convinced that it speaks not only for organized higher education but for a much broader American consensus when it asserts that the opportunities for quality education beyond the high school should be widened and deepened through Federal action. With wise and effective Federal assistance, higher education can be maintained as an important national resource for generations to come.

RESOLUTION BY McNARY POOL PORTS ASSOCIATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have appear in the Record a resolution sent to me by the McNary Pool Ports Association of Walla Walla, Wash., expressing its opposition to the proposed used tax on fuel used by inland waterways.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas the McNary Pool Ports Association is comprised of the ports of Benton, Kennewick, Pasco and Walla Walla, all located in the State of Washington and the port of Umatilla located in the State of Oregon; and

³The statements in this paragraph are based on "Financial Aid to the Undergraduate: Issues and Implications," by Elmer D. West, to be published by the American Council on Education.

Whereas the association represents port districts having an area of approximately 6,627 square miles, including some of the most productive agricultural and industrial land in the Pacific Northwest, having an assessed valuation in excess of \$213,435,004; and

Whereas the above-mentioned port districts are charged with the responsibility of the development of the overall transportation complex in their respective districts; and

Whereas in excess of 1 million tons annually have passed the McNary lock and dam and upon completion of the Lower Snake River Dams, including Ice Harbor, Lower Monumental, Little Goose and Lower Granite, will increase very substantially; and

Whereas this development will aid the shipper and consumer of the McNary Pool area and beyond due to a very large dependence upon inland waterways transportation; and

Whereas the President of the United States on April 5, 1962, sent to Congress contained in his transportation message a recommendation for a user tax of 2 cents a gallon on all fuel used by inland waterways carriers; and

Whereas this proposal contains dangers readily recognized by all who are familiar with waterways transportation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the McNary Pool Ports Association and the port districts belonging thereto, both individually and collectively, That this association is unalterably opposed to the enactment of any user charge proposal on our inland waterways, and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Northwest congressional delegation and other appropriate Government agencies.

RESOLUTION BY FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a resolution from the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Portland Aerie No. 4, Portland, Oreg., received from Chester E. Capon.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas many areas of the world are confronted with the threat of domination by those whose policies are repugnant to the principles long cherished by a democratic society; and

Whereas it is vital that means of communication be established throughout the free world whereby all people would be better informed and educated and thus be given an opportunity not only to guide their own destiny, but be better able to cope with the moral, religious, economic and political problems of an ever changing universe; and

Whereas the United States of America has an abundance of technical equipment such as television receivers, television signal repeaters and electrical generators, some of which it is believed should be made immediately available without charge to any country desiring the same for the purpose of the dissemination of information and education consistent with the precepts of a democratic society; and

Whereas the Fraternal Order of Eagles subscribes to the democratic principles of truth, justice, liberty and equality and seeks every opportunity to promote those programs and to adopt those principles designed for the social betterment of man: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Portland Aerie No. 4, requests that the United States of America proceed with all reasonable vigor to seek the establishment of free educational television within the boundaries of those countries desiring or requesting the same for the purpose or purposes indicated herein; and be it further

Resolved, That President J. F. Kennedy, Senators Wayne L. Morse and M. B. Neuberger, and Representative Edith Green, be forwarded a copy of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the appropriate office of the Grand Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, with a request that every other aerie within its jurisdiction support this resolution.

At test:

CHESTER E. CAPON,
Secretary.

CIA PROBLEMS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an item from the Insider's Newsletter, dealing with some of our CIA problems, about which I shall speak at some length next week.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SAY CIA AGENTS IN CONTACT WITH DE GAULLE'S FOES—U.S. EMBASSY FROWNS ON MEETINGS WITH FORMER OAS LEADERS

New York, February 18.—Agents of the United States, presumably of the Central Intelligence Agency, have resumed contact with former OAS leaders since President De Gaulle's bid for French supremacy in Europe, the Insider's Newsletter reported today.

American Embassy officials in Paris are, according to the Newsletter, disturbed over U.S. agents' meetings with the Georges Bidault-Jacques Soustelle group which advocates a pro-Atlantic alternative to De Gaulle, whom they say will eventually hand France and Western Europe to the Communists.

Diplomats say the U.S. agents have met the anti-De Gaulleists frequently during the past month in Central Europe where the former backers of the French underground move around constantly with the aid of forged passports.

The Embassy officials deplore, the Newsletter says, what they call another example of ham-handedness on the part of the cloak-and-dagger men who "see politics purely in terms of whom you can get to throw out the guy you don't get along with."

They emphasize that the last thing the U.S. Government wants to do is to be shown intriguing with people who have no backing in France except from a mixed bag of fascists, cashed-in army officers, and gunmen.

ADDRESS BY CLARK R. MOLLENHOFF

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, recently the Editorial Association of the State of Oregon made a very wise decision. It invited one of our most able correspondents, Clark Mollenhoff, to go to Oregon and address the national convention of the Editorial Association. It is a memorial lecture that is given each year known as the Eric W. Allen memorial lecture.

Eric Allen was for many years the distinguished dean of the Oregon School of Journalism. I need not tell the Senate that any lecture given by Mr. Mollen-

hoff deserves reading and deserves being made of historical record.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that Mr. Mollenhoff's lecture of February 15, 1963, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the lecture was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ERIC W. ALLEN MEMORIAL LECTURE

(By Clark R. Mollenhoff, Washington bureau, Cowles Publications, February 15, 1963)

Much has changed in the newspaper world in the 50 years since Eric W. Allen founded the Department of Journalism at the University of Oregon. Reporters and editors are better educated than in the period of even 25 or 30 years ago. There has been a specialization on many of our larger newspapers that is regarded by some observers as a tremendous step in giving the public a better understanding of such fields as education, science, and labor. Certainly, most local newspaper staffs are better equipped today to report and analyze the activities of local and State government than they were in 1912. Much credit for this progress belongs to men like Eric Allen.

However, there is real reason for asking if the newspapers are keeping pace with the national and international problems that confront our society. These problems involve both bigness and complexity. They are best illustrated by a simple reference to the tremendous increase in Federal responsibilities and Federal expenditures.

In 1912, Federal expenditures were less than \$1 billion—\$689,881,000 to be exact. Recently, President Kennedy has proposed a budget of \$98.8 billion, and it could easily soar over the \$100 billion mark. More than \$50 billion of the Federal spending will be for defense. This means it will be spent behind a heavy curtain of military security that will prevent the press and the public from examining many of the decisions of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara.

There can be little doubt, we have reached the point where it is impossible for any newspaper reporter, or any group of reporters, to engage in a comprehensive analysis of government spending. The size of the spending is staggering. The complexity of the laws and regulations is overwhelming. The powers assumed by the executive branch are almost unbounded.

Yet, somehow, we must manage to examine and criticize this mammoth Federal Government if we are to carry out our assignment in the American democracy. Somehow, we must find the means to expose corruption or favoritism even if it involves areas where the Defense Department may seek to use false claims of military security for a shield. Somehow, we must oppose the arbitrary and arrogant use of authority within the huge bureaucratic agencies. Somehow, we must keep all channels of information open unless the real military security of our Nation is at stake. And even in those areas where genuine military security can be claimed, we must assure ourselves that the Congress has provided an effective check on the use of arbitrary power by the executive branch.

Bound up in these press responsibilities is the most vital issue of our time: Can the United States fight effectively in the long-range cold war, and also continue to function as a real democracy?

The newspapers of the United States must carry a heavy responsibility, if not the major responsibility, in the determination of how that question will be answered in the next 10 to 20 years ahead of us. Newspaper editors and reporters must be able to understand the problem of obtaining information from Government. They must know all the avenues for obtaining information, and must recognize when those avenues are being



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 109

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 4, 1963

No. 33

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Ephesians 3: 16: That He would grant you to be strengthened with might by His spirit in the inner man.

Almighty God, during this Lenten season may we become richer in the culture of our souls and stronger in gaining the mastery over every insurgent impulse, every inordinate desire, and every self-indulgent habit.

May we daily cultivate a more intimate and radiant fellowship with the spirit of the lowly Man of Galilee who went about doing good and who called upon His followers to share their strength with the weak, their sympathy with the sorrowing, their substance with the poor, and to give their hearts to God.

Inspire us to live among our fellow men as messengers of helpfulness whose minds and hearts are impervious to the spirit of self-seeking and self-glory but who are defining and interpreting life in terms of its usefulness and its value in contributing to the building of Thy kingdom and the blessedness of all mankind.

In Christ's name we offer our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 28, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 6, of February 27, 1963, on House Joint Resolution 249, I am recorded as being absent. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL WEDNESDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House

adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF LABOR DEPARTMENT

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to note that it was just 50 years ago that President Taft signed into law the bill creating a new Department of Labor.

Thereby the concern of America for its working men and women was evidenced and in the ensuing years of expanding industrialization the wisdom of having the Government interest itself in workers and working conditions has been fully demonstrated.

Under free labor and a free system of enterprise, and under also our great Constitution and Bill of Rights, this Nation has been producing 35 percent of the world's goods through the organized effort of only 6 percent of the world's population.

This achievement has been possible because of our system of economic freedom and the wage and profit incentives under it during the past half century.

I want to express my appreciation of the Department of Labor and extend this tribute to the workers of America who look to this Department to oversee their interests and basic rights.

DISARMAMENT AGENCY DEPUTY'S STATEMENT IS BLUEPRINT FOR SELF-MUTILATION

(Mr. HOSMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Adrian S. Fisher, Deputy Administrator of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, speaks for himself, William G. Foster, the Agency's Administrator, and for the President. His statement today on the administration's test ban position

in answer to Senator DeLoach's recent speech is shocking and tragic.

Mr. Fisher has at last revealed the Kennedy administration's blueprint for an American strategy of gradual nuclear self-mutilation.

Fisher's claim that "the strategic military balance between the United States and the U.S.S.R. could not be altered in any major way" by clandestine Soviet test cheating flies in the face of repeated statements to the contrary by several U.S. experts in the actual making of nuclear weapons.

More than that, however, it completely undercuts any reason for U.S. demands for an adequate control system in any test ban treaty. Why should such machinery to detect and verify cheating be included in a treaty if the contention is correct that no significant progress could be made while the Soviet test clandestinely and we test not at all? The administration's position, therefore, must now be that detection and inspection machinery need no longer be insisted upon.

Fisher's words must be a great aid and comfort to the Kremlin. They signal it to sit tight while the Americans cave in on the test ban talks. He has ratified the long-suspected fact that bargaining and negotiation have been replaced by kowtow and concession on the U.S. side of the Geneva conference table.

I intend to issue a series of point-by-point exposures of the fatally dangerous Foster-Fisher fallacies. These gentlemen try to make some kind of meaningful distinction between surrender to Communist objectives on the installment plan and outright relinquishment of the world to Communist domination. There is no such distinction and I do not believe the American people can be sold the bill of goods that there is.

Also I am pressing my request that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy hold exhaustive hearings on non-technical as well as technical factors involved in the test ban.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on February 21, I addressed the House on the subject of my Joint Resolution 254

3189

March 4

to designate the week of May 20 to 26, 1963, as National Actors' Equity Week. In these remarks, on page 2542, I said, in referring to Actors' Equity Association, that "Today its membership claims approximately 13,000 professional actors." However, in the Record this read "1,300 professional actors."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record be corrected to show the true figure of 13,000.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman from New York.

There was no objection.

RESUMPTION OF PUBLICATION OF NEW YORK POST

(Mr. RYAN of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I pointed out in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that in the city of New York there were seven newspapers which were not publishing; that of that number, three had voluntarily ceased publication in accordance with a publishers' agreement and were not under strike. I am delighted to report to the House that the publisher of the New York Post, Mrs. Dorothy Schiff, announced that she would start today to publish the New York Post again. I commend her and believe that this should help to resolve the present labor dispute.

JOINT WATCHDOG COMMITTEE TO OVERSEE CIA

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the CIA is fast becoming the subject of many questions asked in the Congress and in this Nation. The intense interest of the American public in following the handling of the Cuban situation has claimed close attention to the details surrounding U.S. actions in Cuba. The questions are becoming more precise in nature every day. However, such questioning should be above partisan approach but valid questioning of the CIA and other intelligence operations of the U.S. Government is in order.

The major area of concern lies in determining just how far the CIA may have strayed from the intent of Congress; what powers and authority has the CIA acquired or not fulfilled since it was originally established by act of Congress in 1947?

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge the establishment of a joint watchdog committee composed of members of both political parties, from both the House and the Senate, to oversee the activities of the CIA as well as the other intelligence operations of the Government. I urge the Members of both the House and the Senate to join in the effort to establish this joint watchdog committee for the security of our Nation.

Mr. TAFT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

(Mr. McCLODY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the recognition of the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the Department of Labor in the executive department, I have noted an unfortunate failure to recognize the significance of the part played by the late William Howard Taft, 27th President of the United States, who on March 4, 1913, at the very close of his term as President signed the bill establishing the Department of Labor.

It was during the administration of William Howard Taft that important progress was made by the American Federation of Labor, which had more than 1,500,000 members in 1910 and which was composed largely of trade unionists who supported Taft and who resisted with him efforts to wreck the union movement threatened by the expansion of the radical International Workers of the World.

President Taft's role is frequently misinterpreted and often deliberately distorted. During his administration there was greater progress in the elimination of monopoly and restraints of trade than during any prior administration. He proposed and Congress passed the Mann-Elkins Act of 1910 enlarging the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission, established postal savings banks and the parcel post system, and authorized a National Health Bureau and Federal Children's Bureau. By Executive order he extended the merit system in the Postal Department and in the consular and diplomatic services.

On this day when the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the Department of Labor is being celebrated, full recognition should be given to the man whose pen converted this dream into the permanent fabric of our Nation.

I am pleased to join with my esteemed colleague from Ohio, Congressman ROBERT A. TAFT, JR., in this timely recognition of the establishment of the Department of Labor, in connection with which his grandfather, the late William Howard Taft, played such a leading roll.

MEDICAL CARE

(Mr. MATHIAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I introduced a bill which would remove medical care beneficiaries from the welfare rolls of the individual States, H.R. 4388.

Among the recent messages from the White House to the Congress has been the President's message with regard to medical care. This raises again the entire question of medical care which can be provided in this country for all of our citizens regardless of their age or their financial condition. There are not many

Americans who would contest the principle that we should all have available the kind of medical care which our doctors and our scientists have made possible. There is still, however, a considerable dispute as to the means by which this care should be provided particularly to those segments of the population who by reason of age and financial inability have difficulty in getting the kind of hospital treatment and the kind of medical treatment that they need.

Much has been done in this field already, and it is interesting to examine where we now stand with regard to medical care programs. We should also look into some of the suggestions of things that can be done to improve our current legislation on this subject. A program for medical assistance for the aged has been in operation in Maryland since June 1, 1961. This was made possible by the so-called Kerr-Mills bill which was passed by the 86th Congress and signed into law by President Eisenhower in 1960.

Like the other assistance programs in the State, the medical assistance for the aged program is under the supervision of the State department of public welfare and is administered by the county department of public welfare in 23 counties and by the Baltimore City Department of Public Welfare. The department of public welfare is responsible for certification of eligibility for this aid and reinvestigation and recertification are made annually if warranted by changes in the recipient's circumstances. Identifying the need for and arranging medical care, however, are the responsibility of the State department of health in accordance with the contract between the department of welfare and the department of health.

Under this program, in fiscal year 1962, 10,881 applications for medical aid were approved within the State of Maryland. In the first 6 months of fiscal year 1963—that is, from July 1 of 1962 through December 31 of that year—there were 4,417 applications approved. Thus, you will see there is a considerable acceptance of medical aid under this program which has the substantial approval of the medical profession and of the public officials of the State of Maryland. There are, however, improvements that could be made. One of the objections to the Kerr-Mills plan as it is now administered is that applicants must apply to the State welfare department. Many people feel that there is a certain stigma to making applications for welfare aid. This objection has some basis in fact because those who receive medical aid through the welfare department may not otherwise be needful of welfare assistance.

I have, therefore, introduced into the House of Representatives H.R. 4388, a bill which will change the Kerr-Mills law permitting individual States to select the agency to be responsible for medical assistance for the aged. This will be to every State's advantage and I believe that it will simplify efforts to provide comprehensive and continuous care to all of our citizens who need it. Through changes such as this, the Kerr-Mills medical program can be improved to meet the demands of the American people.

Outstanding experts on Federal fiscal problems will be invited to give the committee the benefit of their views and recommendations. Members of the Senate or the House of Representatives and others who may desire to be heard, or who wish to submit statements, relative to the proposed legislation should contact Mr. Walter L. Reynolds, the chief clerk of the committee, room 3304, New Senate Office Building.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS BY COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY ON DAIRY LEGISLATION—STATEMENT BY SENATOR ELLENDER ON HIS RECENT TRIP TO AFRICA

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to make two announcements. The first is that on March 18 the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will begin hearings on all proposed dairy legislation before it.

The second announcement I wish to make is that on next Thursday I will present to the Senate my report on my recent tour of Africa.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Statement on the 50th anniversary of the U.S. Department of Labor.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

Statement by Peter L. Dye, national commander, Disabled American Veterans, to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, on February 7, 1963.

News article entitled "Jackson Urged Polaris Plan 6 Years Ago," written by Marshall McNeill and published in the Washington Daily News of June 30, 1962.

Article entitled "Washington State—America's Scenic Storeroom," written by Byron Fish and published in the Reader's Digest for March 1963, together with a statement relating thereto.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Editorial on proposed U.S. citizenship for Winston Churchill, published in the Danville (Pa.) News of January 19, 1963, and the Washington Star of March 4, 1963.

By Mr. DODD:

Article written by Ross B. Baxter, executive director, Milford (Conn.) Chamber of Commerce, analyzing the past development and present needs of the city of Milford, Conn.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Article entitled "The School Prayer Decision: Where Is It Taking Us?" published in the Washington Star of March 3, 1963.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

Article entitled "How U.N. Conference Attacked World Poverty," written by Sol M. Linowitz and published in the Rochester Times-Union of February 23, relating to the recent conference on the application of science and technology for the benefit of the less developed areas held in Geneva, Switzerland.

By Mr. METCALF:

Article entitled "Stream Shift Injurious to Fishing," published in the December 12, 1962, issue of the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune.

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

Article entitled "Two Perils for the Tax Program," written by William S. White and published in the Evening Star on February 27, 1963.

By Mr. THURMOND:

Article entitled "Should I Compete for a West Point Nomination?" written by Maj. Gen. W. C. Westmoreland and published in the March 1963 issue of Army Information Digest.

Article entitled "Ruling Underlines Need for Curbs," written by David Lawrence and published in the Greenville (S.C.) News of March 3, 1963, relating to picketing and other demonstrations against segregation.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

Announcement of 1962 American Success Story Award to Mrs. Mae Bonnell Sauls.

By Mr. HARTKE:

Commentary by Gunter Marquard, a German political journalist, on the incident of August 18, 1962, when an 18-year-old East Berlin construction worker was shot and left to bleed to death near the Berlin Wall.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, 30 years ago a new President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, came into office. He was one of the great Presidents of our time. His contributions have been many, and the marks he left are visible even to this day.

Fifty years ago the Department of Labor came into being, under the auspices of a Republican President; and I am glad to note that anniversary today, and to commend the Department of Labor for its many fine activities through the years.

Thirty years ago, the Nation was in the midst of the great depression. It was the year in which a new President came into the White House and, with great determination and courage and with imagination and boldness in public policies, restored to the people of the United States hope in their system and in their future. One of his supporters in the election campaign which led to his election was a public-spirited Virginian.

In the same period, the same Virginian came into the Senate. From the outset, he was a man of independent views; but he understood the problems confronting the President and the Nation, and he did his part in seeing to it that those problems were faced in the Senate, and that appropriate remedies were devised.

Through the years, Mr. President, through the administrations of President Roosevelt, President Truman, and President Eisenhower, and into that of President Kennedy, the same Senator has continued to serve his State and the Nation. Sometimes he has agreed with Presidents, and sometimes he has not; but he has never failed to face the issues frankly, and to see to it, insofar as it lay within his power to do so, that the Senate faced them. That has been his hallmark.

It was 30 years ago to the day that HARRY BYRD came to the Senate. He has seen this country grow under policies which he has espoused and also under policies with which he disagreed. He has not won all the battles, nor has he lost them all. But, either way, the Nation

has gained because those battles were fought.

Nor are the battles over, Mr. President. The Senator from Virginia sits as chairman of the Finance Committee at a moment when great and complex social and economic issues, involving finance, are once again in the forefront of the Nation's concern. I do not look to the Senator from Virginia to agree with the President or to disagree on every issue. I look to the Senator from Virginia to bring to these issues his own, individual wisdom; and I look to him to see to it that these issues are faced by the Senate as a whole. Finally, I look to him—once the decisions are made by the whole Senate—to submerge his own views, to close ranks—whatever the outcome—as the great American that he is and has always been.

So, Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Virginia on his 30th anniversary in the Senate. I wish him many more battles and many more years of service in the Senate and to the Nation.

ASIA'S FRONTIERS OF FREEDOM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, recently there has appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Washington Star, and other newspapers, a series of articles entitled "Asia's Frontiers of Freedom." The articles, written by Richard Dudman, are based upon his journey of observation in the southeast Asian region. These articles constitute a job of first-rate and careful reporting on this region, in which we are deeply involved and about which we are inadequately informed. I commend these articles to the attention of the Senate. They are worth reading and studying in connection with our legislative responsibilities. I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch,
Feb. 3, 1963]

ASIA'S FRONTIERS OF FREEDOM—U.S. POLICY: PLUSSES, MINUSES, AND QUESTIONS—HARD GOING FOR YEARS INDICATED IN FIGHT TO ROLL BACK RED CHINESE

(By Richard Dudman)

(First of a series)

American policy along the rim of China can best be characterized as a holding operation.

It is really not a single policy, but a collection of different policies.

It supports the national leaders—mainly dictators—who say they are for us and against communism. It sometimes helps and sometimes ignores the leaders—also mainly dictators—who call themselves neutrals. It frowns on a third group of dictators, those who side with the Communists.

It guarantees the territory of Chiang Kai-shek, joins with China and the Soviet Union to support a neutral coalition government in Laos but hesitates to give similar assurances when Cambodia requests them. It spurns altogether a request for diplomatic relations with Outer Mongolia.

The best that officials in Washington can do to give coherence to these varying and sometimes contradictory policies is to say

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3265

Resolved, That there shall be printed as a Senate document compilation of materials entitled "Summer Employment; by College Students in the Federal Government—1961", prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress; and there shall be printed six thousand two hundred additional copies of such Senate documents for the use of the Members of the Senate.

AUTHORITY TO SIGN ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign, during the adjournment following today's session, the enrolled joint resolution (H.J. Res. 284) making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN NEW PACKAGES OF IMPORTED ARTICLES TO BE MARKED SHOWING COUNTRY OF ORIGIN—AMENDMENT

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, last Thursday I introduced four measures to offer some relief for the American lumber industry in its fight against increased Canadian imports of softwood lumber into the United States. One of the bills I introduced at that time, S. 957, would amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require the marking of lumber and wood products to indicate the country of origin. I later found out that on the same day, February 28, a House-passed bill, H.R. 2513, was referred to the Senate Finance Committee. H.R. 2513 would amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin.

In keeping with my statement that I will continue to work for relief of the American lumber industry, I today submit an amendment to the House-passed bill, H.R. 2513. This amendment would require that lumber and wood products be included under the bill as items to be marked with the country of origin.

I am also sending a letter to the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to the effect that I would like to have this amendment considered by his committee when H.R. 2513 is up for consideration.

I hope, in this way, to expedite the handling of one aspect of legislative relief for the American lumber industry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF ARMS CONTROL ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from New York

[Mr. JAVITS] be added as a cosponsor of S. 777, a bill to amend the Arms Control Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS ACT OF 1963—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 865) to provide for the establishment of the National Academy of Foreign Affairs, and for other purposes the names of the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], the senior Senator from Hawaii, [Mr. FONG], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE] be added as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], I ask unanimous consent that upon the next printing of Senate Concurrent Resolution 23, introduced by me on February 25, providing for the establishment of a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence, that the names of Senators BARLETT and GRUENING, of Alaska, be added as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of February 20, 1963, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills and concurrent resolution:

S. 861. A bill to provide for the general welfare by assisting the States, through a program of grants-in-aid, to establish and operate special hospital facilities for the treatment and cure of narcotic addicts: Mr. LONG of Missouri and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

S. 862. A bill to provide that, for purposes of certain studies, investigations, and demonstrations authorized with respect to mental illness under the Public Health Service Act, addiction to narcotics be considered as a mental illness: Mr. LONG of Missouri and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

S. 863. A bill to amend chapter 402 of title 18, United States Code, to make the Federal Youth Corrections Act applicable to certain persons who violate the Federal narcotics statutes: Mr. LONG of Missouri.

S. 864. A bill to enable the courts more effectively to deal with the problem of narcotic addiction: Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

S. Con. Res. 21. Concurrent resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the matter of general disarmament and arms control: Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. FONG, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. MECHEM, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota.

NOTICE OF MEETING OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, section 712 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, provides that the Joint Committee on Defense Production shall be composed of 10 members, 5 of them members of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, and 5 of them members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. The law provides that these five members from each of the committees are to be appointed by the chairman of the respective committee, three from the majority and two from the minority party.

During the last session of Congress the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Defense Production were Senators SPARKMAN, DOUGLAS, CAPEHART, BENNETT, and myself.

Senators SPARKMAN, DOUGLAS, BENNETT, and I wish to continue as members. In addition, in accordance with section 712 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, I have appointed Senator TOWER as a member of the Joint Committee on Defense Production.

A meeting of the Joint Committee on Defense Production has been called for 10:30 a.m., Thursday, March 7, for the purpose of electing officers and adopting rules for this Congress. The meeting will be held in room S-126 of the Capitol.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I wish to announce a forthcoming hearing on the constitutional rights of the American Indian. The hearing is scheduled to begin at 10 a.m. on March 7, in room 457 of the Senate Office Building.

The subcommittee has been conducting a nationwide investigation on Indian rights since 1961. It appears from the hearings and investigations held in seven States and the District of Columbia that congressional clarification is needed to guarantee more fully Indian citizens their rights. Since a large number of tribal delegations will be in Washington during the week of March 4 to 8, the subcommittee feels it appropriate to schedule a hearing to receive the views of the tribal representatives, not heretofore represented in our study, who wish to be heard.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 537, TO CREATE A JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, BY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the Committee on Government Operations will hold hearings on the bill, S. 537, proposing the creation of a Joint Committee on the Budget on March 19 and 20, 1963. This bill was introduced in the Senate on January 25, under the sponsorship of 77 Senators. Full details relative to its purpose and objectives are set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at pages 1036 through 1042.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 109

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 10, 1963

No. 53

House of Representatives

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:
Galatians 2: 20: The life which I now live, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.

O Thou God of all grace and goodness, may we contemplate the meaning of this Holy Week with a humble spirit and a contrite heart.

Grant that we may daily have within our souls the glorious feeling that by commemorating and observing the Lenten service we have been spiritually enriched.

We rejoice that by the cross and resurrection of our Lord, Thou hast sealed and certified unto us the truth of Thy eternal love for all mankind.

On Easter Sunday may we share in the resurrection of the risen Christ by rising with Him in newness of life to build that blessed highway which humanity shall walk together in His spirit of love.

In His name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4423. An act permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 4. An act to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes;

S. 18. An act to change the name of Harpers Ferry National Monument to Harpers Ferry National Historical Park;

S. 138. An act to redesignate the Big Hole Battlefield National Monument, to revise the boundaries thereof, and for other purposes; and

S. 932. An act relating to age limits in connection with appointments to the U.S. Park Police.

SILENT SPRING

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today that is of the utmost importance. It is also timely in that this legislation, immediately enacted, will help stem the time of another "silent spring." My distinguished colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] and others have already called attention to the great problems that confront us through the continued and unwise use of chemical pesticides. Many of my distinguished colleagues have warned about this in the past, and many of us in this House have been concerned with this problem for a long time. We were happy when Miss Rachel Carson received a national audience with her bestselling book, "Silent Spring," which warned of the uncontrolled use of chemical pesticides and said that synthetic chemicals could upset the balance of nature and endanger man's existence.

This legislation, in the form of two bills, will help to insure the maintenance of the critical balance between the life-giving products and the life-destroying byproducts caused by the misuse of insecticides.

In regards to the first bill, I think that it is essential that before any Federal Government program involving the use of pesticides or other chemicals designed for mass biological controls there should be advance consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service and with State wildlife agencies. This is the Chemical Pesticides Coordination Act, and would be a vastly important improvement over present standards.

The other bill would amend the act of August 1, 1958, in order to prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife from the use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and pesticides.

I would seriously hope that these bills be examined by this Congress in this ses-

sion. This 88th Congress could perform a great service to the Nation by quickly and sensibly putting these excellent and necessary bills in the form of public laws.

Thank you.

DISTURBING NEW EVIDENCE ON CIA

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, additional reasons why CIA was unable to produce photographs of the Russian military buildup in Cuba last autumn were revealed by Secretary McNamara and Pentagon intelligence chiefs in testimony released by the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

According to testimony, there had been photographing the wrong end of the island—the eastern end—despite reliable intelligence reports that the buildup was at the western end.

Earlier, poor weather conditions were blamed for CIA failures. However, as I stated on February 23, weather conditions under which CIA had operated were generally as cloudy and difficult as those which the Air Force encountered the morning of October 14 when its first flight obtained conclusive photographs of Soviet offensive strength in Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, this disturbing new evidence renews the valid questioning of CIA which has been going on for some time now. It makes close, constant congressional review of this Agency through a joint House-Senate watchdog committee such as I have proposed even more imperative.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to correct the permanent Record of yesterday, April 9, on page 5707, in the middle of the page in the right-hand column by deleting the sentence "I would be delighted to vote for this."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

5771

April 10

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL
FOUNDATION, INC.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 4715) to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, Inc., with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, line 1, strike out "Incorporated".

Page 3, line 18, strike out "and".

Page 3, line 18, after "health" insert "and the furtherance of international good will".

Page 4, strike out lines 9 to 22, inclusive, and insert:

"(5) to take by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest from any public body or agency or any private corporation, association, partnership, firm, or individual, and to hold absolutely or in trust for any of the purposes of the corporation any property, real, personal, or mixed, necessary or convenient for attaining the objects and carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation, subject, however, to applicable provisions of the law of any State (A) governing the amount or kind of property which may be held by, or (B) otherwise limiting or controlling the ownership of property by, a corporation operating in such State;"

Page 10, line 11, strike out "Foundation, Incorporated", and insert "Foundation". Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee explain the nature of these amendments and their effect upon the bill as it has already passed?

Mr. CELLER. The amendments in general are technical except one; namely, adding to the purpose of the incorporation the expansion of international good will.

Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from Senator KEATING, the distinguished junior Senator from the State of New York, this morning. He is a member of the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations of the Judiciary Committee. He said he inserted, or, rather, his committee inserted that provision because he felt that Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt in her lifetime spent a great deal of time in an endeavor to establish international good will. He also said that statement was self-explanatory.

I would say that the purpose would be to improve the image that Europeans have of the American abroad. I think that image was greatly distorted, and one of the purposes of this, of course, would be to improve that image. I will say also that I do not think we need have any fear on this score.

Mr. Speaker, in all probability I will be a member of the board of directors of this organization. I do not think I would breach any confidence when I say that. There is a provision in the charter to the effect that we have the right to make, alter, or amend the charter it-

self. We have the right of visitation and the right to examine programs and so forth. If anything is done of an untoward nature under that clause with reference to the spread of international good will, I certainly would know about it and report back to the committee and we would have the right to alter, amend, or change the Federal charter.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is anything about which to be concerned by the addition of that language.

Mr. MATHIAS. Would the gentleman say that the purpose and intent of this amendment would be to permit acts of international good will of a private, eleemosynary rather than political nature?

Mr. CELLER. Yes. As was explained before the gentleman's subcommittee this morning, some of the moneys to be raised would be used for scholarships abroad. In other words, foreigners would come to this country, and vice versa, again in the interest of international good will.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I just say in furtherance of what the chairman of the Judiciary Committee has just said, that to be very specific about it there is now in operation an international fellowship program for cancer research which would be supported by this Foundation. It was thought that without some language as proposed on the Senate side, the support of that program might not be justified. Further than that, I have conferred with the members of the committee and they assure me that this, plus such other things as carrying on the interest that my mother had in children throughout the world, would be the type of thing and only this type of thing which would be considered.

Mr. Speaker, may I simply add to what the chairman of the full committee has said. I am not so sure that I will always be returned to Congress, but the chairman, of course, is assured of reelection, nevertheless if I am there—and I hope to be there—I too would certainly resent and I would come back to the House if I were a Member of this group and ask action on the part of the House to prevent anything else in the construction of that language.

Mr. MATHIAS. May I ask the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] about the other amendment of the Senate? It affects or strikes out language which the gentleman from California himself suggested.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If the gentleman will yield further, my understanding is—and I am subject to correction by the lawyers—that this was inserted by the Senate because they did not want a terminal date to become a precedent in Federal charters. However, in the Senate report there is language which merely indicates that it is the understanding that a one-time effort shall be made for fundraising, and that no fundraising shall continue after November 1, 1965, which would be the anniversary of my mother's death.

I would like to reiterate, and I hope that it would be the understanding of the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] and everybody in this House, that they concur in the language of the Senate report. I would also ask the help of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] to see to it that this language was lived up to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] who handled this bill in the Committee on the Judiciary—that is true; is it not?

Mr. FORRESTER. That is correct; yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, let me ask the gentleman if, when the bill was before the House under unanimous consent, the bill having been rewritten by his subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, there was any such language as this in it when it passed the House; and if it was not the understanding that this bill would not be amended to put in language of this kind?

Mr. FORRESTER. I will say this; it was certainly the understanding that there would be nothing added to this legislation which would in anywise complement the particular language which was cut out by the subcommittee and the full committee and brought to the floor of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I will say that this bill would not have gone through the House by unanimous consent if this language had been in it and I object to the passage of it today.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman reserve his right to object to permit me to say something?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, this legislation was amended in the Senate in only three particulars, two of them being virtually technical. One of them struck out the provision which was inserted at the instance of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] which put a stop date on solicitation of funds. The Senate saw fit to take that out. The best answer I can give to that is that it was taken out on account of the fact that they did not want to establish a precedent. Very frankly, I did not see much merit to that argument, but they did incorporate in their report on the other side that they hoped that the solicitations would cease sometime in the year 1965. That is a part of the Senate report. So far as that is concerned I do not think we have too much to worry on that.

The gentleman had some apprehension and I knew he had some apprehension concerning the granting of any power from the international standpoint that would bear the impress or the implied approval of the Congress of the United States and thereby perhaps create some embarrassing situation sometime or other as to whether this was the act of a private corporation or the act of the Government or whether it was done with the permission or with the implied consent of the Government.

I might say here and now that in the hearing we had this morning it was understood and is now understood by

1 CONGRESS CAN KEEP A SECRET
Approved For Release 2005/06/06 : CIA-RDP71B00364R000600100006-5

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was granted permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, former CIA Director Allen Dulles told the Magazine Publishers Association last Tuesday evening that he knew from experience that Congress could keep a secret. *file*

To prove his point, Mr. Dulles revealed that he had told Congress about our U-2 flights some 5 years before one was shot down over Russia in May 1960.

I certainly agree with Mr. Dulles, and to prove my point I would like to cite the Hoover Commission report which recommended the establishment of a joint congressional watchdog committee to oversee the CIA. That report, transmitted to the Congress in 1955, showed the similarity between such a watchdog committee and the now existing Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which has jurisdiction over our Nation's nuclear secrets. To my knowledge, there has never been an atomic secret which has leaked from that committee into alien hands.

We live in a free society. That is our Nation's strength. We are forced by world circumstances to engage in the clandestine affairs of international espionage, and have made exceptions to national principles where such efforts are necessary. When Congress created the Central Intelligence Agency in 1947, it granted the CIA privileged exemption from the scrutiny of a free society. However, Congress was painfully neglectful in not providing itself with a sufficient channel for communication and liaison with CIA stewardship.

And Congress knows that no Government agency should be left alone to police itself. Lack of congressional supervision only permits Government bureaus to follow an independent course of action—in effect, to bypass the Congress itself, leaving the American people with a diluted voice in their own affairs.

The CIA is the only Government bureau not subject to routine control by Congress. CIA activities should be given careful and regular review. Secrecy can be maintained in the Congress, and the right of congressional review in sensitive areas should not be questioned.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of a joint House-Senate watchdog committee to give constant and needed review to the intelligence activities of this Nation.

mittee on House Administration, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on the Judiciary, which matters are completed we will have finished the business of the week and it will be our hope that we may adjourn over until Monday.

With reference to the inquiry of the gentleman from Indiana, the distinguished minority leader, as to the program for next week, Monday is Consent Calendar day and there are seven suspensions, as follows:

H.R. 199, deaf veterans, increase compensation.

H.R. 211, increase compensation, parents of children of deceased veterans.

H.R. 214, statutory award for aphonia.

H.R. 220, new modified life plan for NSLI policyholders.

H.R. 228, additional pay, directors and chiefs of staffs, VA medical installations.

H.R. 243, increased compensation for certain service-connected disabled veterans.

H.R. 248, paraplegic housing program.

On Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called and we will take up the Department of the Interior appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1964.

The program for Wednesday is undetermined.

On Thursday we will take up the Treasury, Post Office, and executive offices appropriation bill for 1964.

This announcement, of course, is made with the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program will be announced later.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN'S 85TH BIRTHDAY

(Mr. RYAN of New York, asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate one of the great Americans of our times on his 85th birthday—Senator Herbert H. Lehman.

As Governor of New York, as U.S. Senator from New York, as Director-General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, and most of all as a beacon of American liberalism, Senator Lehman has made a substantial and everlasting contribution to our democracy.

ideals of Eleanor Roosevelt, who because of her great contribution to humanity came to be known as the First Lady of the World. Since Congress was not in session at the time of her death last November, I think it is fitting that we pause to pay our respects to the memory of the beloved and revered Eleanor Roosevelt.

CONGRESS MUST RENEW PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN CIA

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the entire scope of this Nation's intelligence operations have come under serious discussion in recent weeks. It is true that a vital need exists for coordinating the intelligence functions of the CIA, State Department, and the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Clearly, this need has come forth in the wake of each new phase of the current Cuban crisis.

But as responsible Americans and elected officials we must address ourselves to the responsibilities inherent in citizenship in our Nation. The proper arena for coordinating the daily classified actions of the CIA and other intelligence agencies is not on the floors of the House and Senate, but within the sanctity of a joint congressional watchdog committee composed of Members of both the House and Senate.

House Joint Resolution 211, which I introduced, proposes such a committee, as do the growing number of companion bills being introduced almost daily by Members of both the House and Senate.

The establishment of this watchdog committee would cure the ills which have resulted from poorly coordinated intelligence information, and serve a twofold purpose:

First. It would allow Congress to give regular scrutiny and constant review to our intelligence operations.

Second. It would reestablish public confidence in our Nation's intelligence community.

Support for this committee is growing as its need becomes more evident. The reasoning for congressional check on intelligence operations is clearly put forward in the very fine editorial in today's Washington Daily News.

This joint watchdog committee was recommended by the Hoover Commission, the bipartisan panel created by Congress to study ways of bringing greater efficiency to our Government. I urge all these who have not yet done so to join the movement now underway to perfect our Nation's intelligence affairs.

WHISTLE UP THE WATCHDOG

Senator KEATING, of New York, was the first to sound a warning about the Soviet buildup in Cuba. He has been the most persistent, and consistent, of those declaiming on the way the Kennedy administration has handled this hot cigar.

This week the Senator was at pains, in remarks on the Senate floor, to say our intelligence services—and specifically the mysterious Central Intelligence Agency—

have been "hard at work, producing accurate information."

According to him, there is no "intelligence gap," as some have alleged. The gap, the Senator charged, is not in the fact-gathering but in what he called the failure of the administration to pass the facts along to the people.

Coming from Senator KEATING, this applause for the CIA—about which so few know so little—is comforting. And it helps make the point that Congress should set up a "watchdog" committee to keep track of what that hush-hush Agency is doing. Its operations are secret, necessarily, but if the public can hear from men like Senator KEATING, who is a Republican, that the job is being properly done, it can feel more secure.

Also, if a bipartisan committee of Congress is "in the know" with the CIA, it will be less easy for any administration to hold back facts the public should know.

The CIA watchdog committee was recommended 8 years ago by a Hoover Commission task force headed by Gen. Mark W. Clark, World War II hero. It has been urged at this session of Congress by such Democrats as Senators McCARTHY, of Minnesota, and SMATHERS, of Florida, and by Congressman PAUL ROGERS, of Florida.

The idea is sound, safe, urgent, necessary.

PROPOSAL FOR COMMEMORATIVE POSTAGE STAMP HONORING CUSTOMS MEN WHO LOST THEIR LIVES IN THE SERVICE

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on August 1, 1964, the Bureau of Customs of the Treasury Department is planning to celebrate the 175th anniversary of the creation of the customs service by the First Continental Congress. The month of August 1964 will mark the culmination of 1¾ centuries of unbroken dedication to the advancement and protection of the American people by the Bureau of Customs.

It is interesting to recall that three of the first five statutes enacted by that First Congress dealt with customs matters. The first statute enacted by the First Congress provided for the time and manner of administering the oath of office for Members of the Federal Legislature, certain executive officers, and certain officials of the several States (1 Stat. 23, approved June 1, 1789). The second statute was approved on July 4, 1789, and provided for levying duties on imported merchandise. This was the first Tariff Act (1 Stat. 24). The third law imposed duties on tonnage of ships and vessels (1 Stat. 27, approved July 20, 1789). The fourth enactment established an executive department called the Department of Foreign Affairs (1 Stat. 28, approved July 27, 1789). And the fifth statute established the customs service. It was entitled "An act to regulate the collection of the duties imposed by law on the tonnage of ships or vessels, and on goods, wares, and merchandise imported into the United States" and was approved on July 31, 1789 (1 Stat. 29).

The role played by the customs service in molding the United States to its preeminent position in world history has largely been unrecognized by the principal beneficiary—the American people themselves. Since the Continental Congress established the first uniform duties, imposts, and excises throughout the United States, the customs service has systematically and indefatigably dedicated itself to our Nation's development. When our industries were just getting started, the customs laws protected them against foreign competition until they grew to the point where they are a bulwark of democracy. The customs service provided the major share of our Nation's revenue before the income tax was passed by Congress in 1916. Today, customs collections account for \$1¾ billion which still represents a sizable chunk of our national revenue.

The United States has not been extravagant in the use of commemorative stamps as a means of recognition of service to our people, perhaps rightfully. However, it seems to me that our customs service, which has been doing a magnificent job in administering and enforcing our complex tariff laws, combating smuggling, assisting many other U.S. agencies in enforcing their laws and performing countless other important duties, deserves the recognition of a commemorative postage stamp to honor its surpassing performance.

Very few Americans are aware of the fact that many customs officials have sacrificed their lives in carrying out their official duties down through the years since the customs service was born. No better illustration of this exists than the memorial plaque which hangs in the office of the U.S. Commissioner of Customs in Washington. This plaque consists of 17 mounted photographs of officers who lost their lives in the service.

There was the case of Bert Ellison, a mounted inspector from San Antonio, Tex., who lost his life in 1930 while pursuing five Mexican bootleggers. Then there was John Henry Hard, of El Paso, who died from gunshot wounds inflicted in line of duty while investigating horse smuggling, and Loy C. Henry who was shot to death by a paid assassin while combatting a ring of narcotics smugglers. There are others from many other States who also laid down their lives in the line of duty.

Since 1900, 42 customs officers were killed in line of duty by violators of customs laws or by accident while on duty; 49 were seriously wounded or injured by violators; 68 were seriously injured while on duty. During this period 95 smugglers are known to have been killed in gun battles with customs enforcement officers.

It seems fitting that the customs service which entails for some the most hazardous kind of duties is deserving of recognition in the form of a commemorative postage stamp to be issued on the occasion of the 175th anniversary of the Bureau of Customs. Of course, many branches of the customs service are not hazardous under today's condi-

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, MARCH 7, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Rabbi Maurice Lamm, Floral Park Jewish Center, Floral Park, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Supreme and Allwise Lawgiver: Thou who hast endowed men with the noble ambition and blessed ability to lead fellow men in the paths of right in the affairs of state, and hast inspired them to serve the people of these United States with honor:

Invest those legislators gathered here in august assembly with deep souls so that, by personal example, they may illustrate the finest and most worthy traditions of this great Republic to the end that they will lead not by pointing to high ideals but by standing for them.

Grant them great hearts so that through their kindness and care they may bring on a time of healing for the multitude of lives emptied of meaning, for the multitude of souls scarred with the weary search for peace and rest, for the multitude of hearts stabbed with the frustrations of our incredibly complex existence.

Bless them with powerful hands so that, with the practical sagacity which is their hallmark, they may unite and solidify a globe jigsawed with boundaries, separated by Iron and Bamboo Curtains, cut up into airspace, divided by latitude numbers, and fenced with radar screens.

Bestow upon these servants of the public Thy blessings, O Lord.

May the Lord grant strength unto His people.

May He bless His people with peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RAPID EROSION OF OUR NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE EFFORT

(Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I shall ask the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House to undertake to coordinate a course of action for the purpose of halting the rapid erosion of our national intelligence effort. The present situation is outrageous and intolerable.

There has been talk of an intelligence gap. There is an intelligence gap. The gap is in the intelligence of those who are daily revealing the secrets of the intelligence operations of the U.S. Government. In recent weeks there has been a great excess of talk about the procedures of our intelligence apparatus.

Critics have made public statements on matters which should never be discussed in public. The administration has mistakenly allowed itself to be goaded into revealing information detrimental to our best interests.

Along with many other Americans I am tired of these demonstrations of bad judgment. Every day some high ranking intelligence officer is quoted in the newspapers on one subject or another. These are men who, from the standpoint of the general public, should neither be seen nor heard. A passion for anonymity is an integral part of their jobs. Members of both the legislative and executive branches have publicly discussed matters which should only be discussed behind closed doors. Headlines are not so precious as to warrant jeopardizing our national security.

The deterioration of secrecy in regard to our intelligence-gathering techniques began in 1960 when a U-2 plane was shot down over Russia. Neither the executive branch nor the legislative branch is blameless in revealing secrets. Both Democrats and Republicans must share the blame. The question, however, is not so much who is to blame for the past, but Where do we go from here?

To be successful, intelligence activities must be secret. To let the enemy know just how many of his secrets we know and just which ones we do not know, gives him a priceless advantage. Today's headline may cost the lives of the human sources of information. The enemy can find our intelligence sources much more easily when he knows what we have found out. This knowledge helps to pinpoint the location of intelligence activities, and once knowing the location, the discovery of the means is much easier and as a result intelligence sources dry up.

Our immaturity and indiscretion in these constant disclosures is making us the laughingstock of the world. Officials in Moscow, Peiping, and Havana must applaud our stupidity in announcing publicly facts which they would gladly spend huge sums of money endeavoring to obtain. Responsibility on our part is urgently required. Let us be silent with respect to these sensitive matters.

Mr. John McCone, as Director of CIA, is charged with protection of intelligence sources. Public Law 253, 80th Congress, 1st session, states:

And provided further, That the Director of Central Intelligence shall be responsible for protecting intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure.

I call on him to fully carry out the difficult and important duties of his office in this respect. A governmentwide coordination of effort is required.

The American people are interested in our intelligence activities. They are interested in all phases of the workings of their Government and their curiosities are aroused by the aura of mystery and adventure which surrounds the intelligence business. But we are not playing games. Our national survival to a great extent depends upon our knowledge of our enemies' activities. The price we pay for the luxury of public disclosure of intelligence activities is the further erosion of our capabilities in this field. It is difficult enough to obtain information from closed Communist societies. The American people, the press, and the officials of the executive and legislative branches of the Government must stop making a most difficult task more difficult.

There is room for plenty of discussion and criticism of our Government without revealing sensitive intelligence information.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency have until midnight Saturday to file a report on H.R. 3872, the Export-Import Bank, along with minority views.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia have until midnight Saturday, March 9, to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER TO PAY TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE AND IDEALS OF ELEANOR ROOSEVELT

(Mr. RYAN of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have just received permission for a special order to address the House for 2 hours on Wednesday, March 27. The purpose of this special order is to afford an opportunity to all Members of the House to pay tribute to the life and

Only about 25 percent of them are literate. Less than a fourth of the children of school age are in school, and less than 2 percent ever complete secondary education. Pupil-teacher ratios of 100 to 1 are common, compared to about 25 to 1 in the developed countries.

To help meet this challenge, the United States, through the Agency for International Development has established cooperative educational programs in 58 nations. In each the goal is the same: To train people who in turn can train teachers, prepare suitable texts and teaching aids, and themselves develop a strong educational program in their respective countries. Assistance is provided for all levels of education—primary, secondary, and higher education; for all age groups and types of schools—vocational and technical as well as general education; and for construction and equipment as well as for technical assistance.

In 1962, AID obligated \$93 million in U.S. funds plus an additional \$98 million in U.S.-owned local currencies to assist the developing nations in meeting acute educational problems.

In Bolivia, AID projects are being carried out to improve commercial education. Libya, a program in vocational training for farmers, tradesmen, and handicraft artisans is in progress. In Iran, U.S. aid helped to establish an entire vocational education system for the Iranian armed forces.

In Pakistan, an AID team taught Pakistani railwaymen—few of whom spoke the same language or dialect—how to operate diesel locomotives.

With independence approaching in Kenya, an AID-assisted special project has begun to train 47 local government officials for positions of high responsibility in the government when independence is granted.

A fascinating example of an AID project covering several levels of education is the program in Nepal.

Nepal's first teacher-training center was established in 1954 under the direction of the University of Oregon. In 1956 mobile teaching teams were organized to carry teacher training to the remote provinces.

A college of education was established and a staff trained to educate up to 2,000 teachers a year. A bureau of textbook publication was established and several of its Nepalese staff members were sent to the United States for special training. The bureau printed 55 different titles and 225,000 pieces of educational literature in its first 5 years of operation.

More than 2,400 part-time teachers were trained for literacy education, and they in turn taught more than 1,000 adults to read and write in their first year in the field.

Nepal's first national university was established with colleges of liberal arts and sciences, agriculture and forestry, education, law, nursing, and medicine.

Before the AID program began, Nepal had no national university, no teacher-training institutions. Only 1 child in 200 was in school, and only 2 percent of the Nepalese people could read and write. At the end of the first 5 years of the

education project, more than 1,500 new primary classrooms had trained teachers, 200 new schools were receiving financial aid, and 20 new primary texts had been published. Nearly 200 secondary teachers had received bachelor of education degrees and 45 high school teachers had undergone a 1-year course for the improvement of English instruction. In addition, Nepal's entire secondary school curriculum had been revamped to include vocational instruction urgently required in agriculture, home economics, commercial education, and industrial arts.

A program similar to the one in Nepal is now being carried out in India with the assistance of U.S.-AID education teams from Ohio State University and the Teachers College of Columbia University.

In Cambodia a teacher-training program has been under way for 5 years. Prior to 1958 Cambodian students with a sixth-grade education were given a summer of training and then pressed into service as elementary school teachers. Under the AID contract Cambodia's first teacher preparation center was established and has already become the largest educational institution in the country. Each year the center trains 200 elementary school teachers. Another similar institution is now being established with AID assistance to train secondary school teachers.

Television represents a potentially valuable educational medium for the developing nations. In Nigeria, for example, AID has provided an experienced American educational television executive as an adviser to the Nigerian staff of a new educational television station. From 1960 to 1962 the station has telecast more than 700 different programs for a total of 350 hours of instruction to 100 village schools equipped with television sets supplied by the Nigerian Ministry of Education.

Not only teachers, but also classrooms are in short supply in most underdeveloped nations. AID has encouraged the building of new schools and classrooms in many countries by providing technical help and materials while local residents provide the construction labor on a volunteer basis.

The Guatemalan Government launched a self-help school construction program in partnership with AID in 1960. AID and the Guatemalan Government agreed to share equally any costs not absorbed by the local communities. At the beginning of the project, it was expected that volunteer labor would cover about one-third of the cost of construction. In fact, it has accounted for nearly 44 percent of construction costs. During the 3 years since the pilot project began, self-help schools have been built and are now operating in every province of Guatemala. More than 1,100 classrooms in 300 schools have been completed. The enthusiastic turnout of villagers for each school dedication symbolizes the impact of such AID assisted projects on the lives of the people.

Self-help school construction programs like the one in Guatemala are now underway in Chile, Liberia, El Salvador, Haiti, and Honduras.

Another serious educational problem facing many developing nations is that of adult literacy. In Turkey a unique approach to the problem has been instituted with U.S. aid. Literacy training has been given to more than 150,000 Turkish soldiers and an additional 120,000 are expected to complete training each year.

In addition, more than 1,000 primary school teachers have gained literacy teaching experience at the military centers. This group will form the teaching nucleus of a planned civilian literacy program. The goal is to reduce illiteracy in Turkey from 70 to 30 percent by 1975.

In the Turkish project, as in most literacy projects, U.S. experts help local educators prepare training materials, texts, and followup reading materials for use by the newly literate.

As of 1962, the Agency for International Development had undertaken projects to increase the supply and improve the quality of primary and secondary school teachers in 33 Latin American, African, and Asian nations. In Afghanistan, U.S. aid is the only bilateral assistance permitted by the Government in the sensitive area of education.

Because English has become the nearest thing to an international language in many underdeveloped nations, AID has been providing technical assistance for the teaching of English in 14 Asian and African countries.

Finally, 75 American universities and colleges are working under AID contracts in the establishment and improvement of facilities for higher education in more than 26 Asian, African, and South American countries.

Of the many needs of the developing countries none is more crucial than the need for education, in the broadest sense of the word. And of the many parts of our foreign aid program none is more in keeping with American ideals, and the aspirations of Americans for their fellow men around the world, than educational assistance.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A JOINT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN INFORMATION AND INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROYBAL). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] is recognized for 60 minutes, 10 minutes of which have already been consumed by the previous presentation of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER].

(Mr. LINDSAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a resolution for the establishment of a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence. I propose that the committee be constituted roughly along the lines of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and that it have its own funds and staff resources. I propose also that it make continuing studies in the whole area of

our foreign information and intelligence programs.

In my remarks this afternoon, however, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to dwell at great length on the precise terms of this particular resolution. I think it is a good resolution but I am perfectly ready to be persuaded that a better one might be devised. The question of the exact structure and composition of this committee seems to me significantly less important than the more general questions of principle involved. I rise today, not to make propaganda on behalf of a particular proposal of mine, but rather to raise a matter which I think is in need of the widest possible and most intelligent public discussion.

As most Members are aware, the proposal of a Joint Committee on Foreign Intelligence is not a new one. In one form or another it has been introduced into this House in each of the last 10 sessions; in 1955 it was the subject of a 2-day hearing by the Rules Committee. In the Senate the Committee on Rules and Administration reported on it favorably in 1956, and for 2 days it was debated on the floor of that body. Nor is it partisan in nature. Back in 1959 resolutions similar to mine were sponsored in the House by eight Democrats and four Republicans. Earlier this year the matter was brought to our attention by a member of the other party, the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS]. Moreover, when Mr. MANSFIELD's resolution came to a vote in the Senate in 1956, the minority in favor included many Members on both sides of the aisle. On that occasion one of those who voted in favor was the then junior Senator from Massachusetts, now the President of the United States.

If the proposal for a Joint Committee on Foreign Intelligence has come up so often and been supported by so many Members, why has it never been adopted? Frankly I do not find that question easy to answer, particularly since some of the arguments against it seem to me so feeble. Take, to begin with, the argument about secrecy. It is an argument that has been advanced every time the proposal has been discussed. During the Senate debate in 1956 the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Mr. RUSSELL, went so far as to say that, rather than have a committee set up and information made available to Members of Congress, "it would be better to abolish the Central Intelligence Agency and, by doing so, to save the money appropriated and the lives of American citizens." A former Vice President, Mr. Barkley, took the same view in the same debate.

Now no one denies that CIA and other intelligence agencies must conduct a very high proportion of their operations in secret. Secrecy is of the essence of their work; without it they could not function, and the security of our country would be jeopardized. No one denies that. But what is true of the intelligence community is also true in many other areas of government: in the fields of atomic energy, weapons development, and foreign policy, for example. But does this mean that Congress is to have no effective au-

thority in these areas? Of course it does not. Congress has always asserted its right to concern itself with even the most sensitive areas of Government. And, where matters of the highest secrecy have been involved, Members of both Houses have shown themselves perfectly capable of exercising the utmost restraint. This was never more clearly demonstrated than by the experience of the Manhattan project during World War II, when members of the two appropriations committees were kept fully apprised of the progress of the project without on any occasion breaking security. And I am sure all Members of the House will agree that the record of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in this connection has been impeccable.

As in the case of the Atomic Energy Committee, I take it for granted of course that much of the work of the new committee—perhaps almost all of it—would be conducted in private and that the results would be made public only after a close screening by the appropriate Government agencies. Nevertheless, I admit that particular concern might still be felt about CIA, since breaches of security involving CIA might endanger the lives of American operatives in other countries, and also the lives of agents of other nations working in cooperation with us. I think this is a legitimate concern, but I hope to show later in my speech that there are many important aspects of intelligence work which could usefully be studied without any need to inquire in detail into the activities of particular persons and units in the field.

So much for the moment for secrecy. I find myself in even less sympathy with another argument that has also been advanced frequently in discussions of this question—namely, that the intelligence community exists solely to serve the President and the National Security Council, and that therefore we in the Congress have no right to seek a jurisdictional position. This doctrine was stated in an extreme form in 1956 by Mr. HAYDEN in the Senate. He said at that time:

The Central Intelligence Agency is an arm of the President. Under the Constitution, I feel we have no right to attempt to regulate an agency which is designed solely to provide the President, who, under the Constitution, is responsible for our foreign relations, with information to enable him to make decisions.

I, for one, cannot accept that doctrine. As every Member knows, these two branches of our Government, the executive and the legislative, are not watertight compartments separated by steel bulkheads; the material between them is flexible and porous. There are any number of congressional committees which keep a watch over the executive agencies. In this House we have, to name only two, the Foreign Affairs Committee which inquires constantly into the policies and actions of the President and his agents, and the Government Operations Committee which closely scrutinizes the entire organization of the executive branch. The Senate has a subcommittee whose area of operations borders on the very area I am discussing: the Subcom-

mittee on National Security Staffing and Operations.

If we are going to refrain from looking into the affairs of executive agencies, even agencies which report directly to the President, than I fear we are going to have to disband a large number of our committees, or at least to curtail severely their activities. Of course we in the legislature cannot and should not intervene in areas beyond our competence. But in my view we have not only a right but a duty to maintain a general surveillance over agencies like the Central Intelligence Agency, which are established by statute and sustained by funds voted by the Members of these two Houses.

These arguments—concerning secrecy and the exclusively executive nature of the intelligence community—are at least consistent. But strangely enough those who oppose resolutions similar to this have often attempted to maintain, not that for these reasons Congress should abstain entirely from overseeing the intelligence community, but that on the contrary congressional oversight is already more than adequate. Senator RUSSELL made this claim in the debate already quoted, and it was reiterated by Mr. Allen Dulles, the former Director of Central Intelligence, in his recent article in Harper's magazine. What is in fact the extent of congressional surveillance at the moment?

In both the House and Senate the bodies responsible for overseeing the intelligence community are small subcommittees of the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees. Neither the House Foreign Affairs Committee nor the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has jurisdiction in this area despite their obvious interest in intelligence matters. This might not matter were it not for the fact that the surveillance exercised by the four existing subcommittees is almost certainly both cursory and sporadic. For example, last year during a debate in the Senate the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts, my friend, Mr. SALTONSTALL, was asked how much time the Armed Services Subcommittee devoted to the CIA affairs. Mr. SALTONSTALL was perfectly frank. He said:

I say on the floor of the Senate that we spend several hours and go into many details of operations, of expenses, of administration, and so on.

I ask Members to note the phrase "several hours"—not weeks or even days, but hours. The members of one of the most important committees in the other House devote only hours to the affairs of one of the most important agencies of our Government. The reasons for this are surely clear. The members of the four subcommittees lack any staff specialized in these matters; they themselves can have little time or thought to devote them. But even if these subcommittees do have more time for intelligence, nevertheless the disadvantages of having responsibility for the intelligence community divided up among four different subcommittees would, I think, be obvious to everyone. I maintain that congressional surveillance of the intelligence community is not now adequate,

and cannot be adequate as long as it continues to be organized as it is at present.

A moment ago I referred to the Central Intelligence Agency as one of the most important agencies of our Government. What is true of CIA is, of course, even truer of the intelligence community as a whole. Yet from time to time those who maintain that intelligence operations fall exclusively within the executive sphere—those, in other words, who are opposed to the establishment of a joint congressional committee—try to persuade us, despite all we have heard and seen during the past few years, that nevertheless CIA is a purely advisory body, that that it is not directly concerned with the making of national policy. Mr. Allen Dulles himself remarked several years ago:

CIA is not a policymaking Agency: we furnish intelligence to assist in the formulation of policy.

Senator RUSSELL during a debate in the other body was even more blunt:

Some Senators who addressed themselves to the resolution on Monday last, seemed to hold the opinion that the CIA was a policymaking agency. That theme ran all through the remarks which were made in advocacy of the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. President, the Central Intelligence Agency is far from being a policymaking agency. It makes no policy.

The distinguished Senator went on to say that CIA was merely a coordinating and information-gathering body whose function was simply to present its findings to the actual policymaking body, the National Security Council.

Senator RUSSELL said all this in 1956. In my view it was scarcely plausible even then. Now in 1963, after our experiences in Cuba, Laos and elsewhere, to say that CIA is in no sense a policymaking body is to say something that is palpably untrue. The National Security Act, under which CIA operates, does not, of course, formally assign it policymaking functions. But CIA is a policymaking body, and we all know it. The reasons have been well put by Prof. Harry Howe Ransom, our leading lay student of intelligence affairs. In his study "Central Intelligence and National Security," published as early as 1958, he has this to say:

Certainly the CIA has no policymaking responsibility. Yet policy making is not a simple static action. Rather it is a dynamic process. A key element in this process is the information available to policymakers. The man, or group, controlling the information available to policymakers does in fact play a major if indirect role in policymaking.

A few pages later Professor Ransom adds:

It would be unrealistic to suggest that the bright young men of CIA, by training, talent, and personality, do not hold strong views on controversial issues of national security policy. If it is granted that knowledge is indeed power, it will be recognized that in reality the CIA, through an increasing efficiency—and consequently rising credit with responsible decision makers—has come to play a major role in creating national security policy.

Surely those statements can no longer be regarded as anything but the simple truth. In fact even Senator RUSSELL appears to have come round. Last year, during the hearings on the confirmation of Mr. John McCone to be Director of Central Intelligence, Senator RUSSELL remarked:

In this period through which we are passing, this office is perhaps second only to the Presidency in its importance.

A few moments later he repeated the point. I am inclined to agree with Senator RUSSELL. And I submit to you that one does not describe a man as holding an office "second only to the Presidency in its importance" if the agency of which he is the head is not itself a policymaking agency of the very first order of importance.

Up to this point, Mr. Speaker, I have been mainly concerned to clear the ground, as it were—to state as clearly as I could my objections to the arguments most commonly used by opponents of the proposal I am supporting. Only by implication have I suggested positive reasons why I think a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence should be established. I want now to address myself to the central questions: why do I think such a joint committee is necessary? and, equally important, what work do I think it might usefully undertake?

But first I have to make one further point. The Central Intelligence Agency, and indeed the entire intelligence community, is highly—and necessarily—secretive in its mode of operations. For this reason outsiders like myself have no alternative but to rely for their information on newspaper reports, on the occasional published hearings on House and Senate committees, on the work of scholars like Professor Ransom, and on a miscellaneous variety of other sources. In the very nature of things our comments and criticisms cannot be authoritative. We are working in the dark, or at least in the semitwilight. Nevertheless, I think we do know enough to have reasonable grounds for supposing that all is not well within the intelligence community. Even more important, I think we know enough to be certain that we need to know more—and by "we," of course, I mean not necessarily the general public nor even every Member of Congress, but those Members who would serve on the kind of committee I have in mind.

Why, then, do I think such a committee should be established?

I have two general reasons. The first concerns the extraordinary number of specific criticisms that have been leveled over the years against the Central Intelligence Agency and, by implication, against the intelligence community as a whole. Admittedly, as Mr. Allen Dulles recently pointed out:

You cannot tell of operations that go along well. Those that go badly generally speak for themselves.

And I would not want for a moment to deny that the Central Intelligence

Agency has scored a number of quite spectacular successes—the U-2 overflights, for example, and the overthrow of the Mossadegh regime in Iran. On balance it is almost certainly true to say that the intelligence community has served the Nation well. But the fact does remain that on occasion the community has blundered seriously, and that for its blunder the citizens of the United States have paid a heavy price.

Let me refer to just a few instances. Back in 1950, as Mr. Dulles himself has tacitly admitted, the intelligence community failed to anticipate the Chinese Communist intervention in Korea. We are still living with the consequences of that particular failure. A few years later an incident involving the CIA caused us serious embarrassment in the Middle East and may have contributed indirectly to the Suez affair. In July 1956 President Nasser of Egypt claimed in a speech at Alexandria that he had been strongly advised by a U.S. Government official to ignore an important message that he was about to receive from the State Department. It was subsequently confirmed that the official in question had been the regional representative of CIA.

More recently, of course we had the fiasco of the Bay of Pigs. Chief responsibility for that lamentable affair must rest with the President of the United States. However, there can be no question but that the Central Intelligence Agency was deeply involved in the whole affair, and that its actions and advice had a decisive effect on the eventual outcome. Surely most Members of the House will agree that it would be in the national interest to know whether such incidents were merely particular aberrations or whether, in fact, they form a pattern that is likely to be repeated in the future.

My second general reason for pressing for the establishment of this committee I can state quite briefly. It is this. I abhor government by secrecy. I regard it as inimical to the effective functioning of our institutions. I regard it as alien to our American way of life. Above all, I regard it as a threat to our fundamental liberties. I fully realize, of course, it should be clear from what I have said already that a high degree of secrecy is essential to the workings of the intelligence community.

But I fear that with respect to the intelligence community we are often the victims of secrecy for secrecy's sake. Things are done to us and in our name which we know nothing of. I do not wish to see the legitimate secrets of the intelligence community reported in the press and on the air. Of course I do not. But it does seem to me of enormous importance that a few selected representatives of the people, chosen by the two Houses of Congress, should be continuously aware of what the intelligence community is doing and of the way in which it is going about doing it. The American people have at stake, not merely their liberties but their lives.

August 15

Despite all I have said so far, there would, of course, be little point in establishing this joint committee unless we had some fairly clear idea of what we thought it should do, of what subjects we thought it should study. I propose, therefore, to continue by discussing four questions, all of high importance, which I think might usefully be investigated: first, the relations between the Central Intelligence Agency and the State Department, especially overseas; second, the relations between intelligence-gathering on the one hand and so-called special operations on the other; third, the selection and training of intelligence personnel; and fourth, the whole question of intelligence evaluation. I propose to deal briefly with the first three of these questions and to say rather more about the fourth.

First, the relations between CIA and the State Department.

The problem here has been posed succinctly by Henry Howe Ransom in the book I have already cited. On page 216 he writes:

The operation by the U.S. Government of a farflung secret apparatus for intelligence gathering and political action could have widespread diplomatic ramifications. There may be a basic incompatibility between the maintenance of accredited diplomatic missions in some 78 foreign posts (as of 1958)—

The number would be considerably greater now—

and the existence of American secret agents in most of these same foreign areas. Greatest care must be exercised in keeping U.S. diplomacy separated from spying and backstage political maneuvering, at least on the surface, yet the diplomats probably should not be completely in the dark as to the activities of American secret agents.

The possibly disruptive effect of having, on the premises of American embassies abroad or in the field, agents who owe allegiance to someone other than the ambassador and to an organization other than the State Department and who may be engaging in activities running counter to expressed State Department policy, scarcely needs spelling out in detail.

Nor are these dangers merely speculative. It seems, for example, that toward the end of the Chinese civil war remnants of Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist Army moved into parts of northern Burma. These troops claimed to be eager to harass the Communists across the border, and CIA accordingly supplied them with large quantities of money and arms. But according to available reports the Chinese had long since tired of fighting. Instead of attacking the Communists, they proceeded to settle down, to occupy much of the best agricultural land in northern Burma, and to cultivate opium—all with the assistance of U.S. funds.

This would have been a melancholy episode in any case. But what made it worse was the fact that our Ambassador in Rangoon apparently had not the faintest idea of what CIA was doing. When the Burmese Government formally complained to the United States, the Ambassador issued a categorical denial; he said the United States had nothing

to do with the activities of the Nationalist Chinese. Our Ambassador of course believed he was telling the truth. But what he was saying was in fact not true, and naturally the Burmese were shocked by this apparent evidence of American duplicity. What was the upshot of this episode? The American Ambassador resigned, the U.S. Government was deeply embarrassed, and the Government of Burma threatened for a time to break off diplomatic relations.

Admittedly, this incident was particularly ludicrous. But it is not without parallel. Our policy in the early stages of the Laotian crisis appears to have been constantly bedeviled by a lack of effective coordination between the CIA and the State Department. Similarly with Cuba prior to the Bay of Pigs invasion. Mr. Tad Szulc and Mr. Karl Meyer, in their able account of that affair, describe how, on its own initiative, CIA established close working relations with exiled supporters of the former dictator Batista. They add:

This decision marked the inauguration of what, in effect, became its independent foreign policy toward Cuba, in cavalier disregard of the thinking in the White House and the State Department.

Note that all this occurred despite the efforts of an earlier Secretary of State, Mr. Christian Herter, to regularize relations between the State Department and CIA. Since then the Herter-Allen Dulles agreement on the relations between Ambassadors and CIA personnel in the field has been reaffirmed by Mr. Rusk and Mr. McCone. And by now we have reason to hope that the responsible foreign policymakers—the President and the National Security Council—have reasserted their authority over the Central Intelligence Agency. I agree that to a considerable extent this is a problem of particular persons and particular situations. But it is also the case that, as long as both State Department and CIA personnel are working in the field, as long as both agencies are responsible for the collection of information, and—perhaps most important—as long as CIA continues to be responsible for special operations, the problem of integrating the Central Intelligence Agency into our general foreign policy apparatus will remain difficult and will remain worthy of close and continuous examination. The exercise of surveillance in this field I conceive to be one possible function of a Joint Congressional Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence.

A moment ago I alluded to the conduct by the CIA of so-called special operations; that is, the fomenting of opposition against hostile governments, the arming of insurgents, the provocation of enemy action, and so on. The question of housing these special operations—or additional services or other functions or whatever you want to call them—under the same roof as the CIA's purely intelligence-gathering operations has, of course, long been a matter of controversy, and it is this question that I suggest might usefully be the second of the new joint committee's areas of study.

I do not suppose we need to be reminded of the importance of this ques-

tion. The Bay of Pigs invasion was only the most spectacular and best publicized of CIA's special operations. There was the Iranian affair in 1953, and the following year the overthrow of the Arbenz regime in Guatemala. CIA also appears to have had a hand in the main risings in Eastern Europe, in East Berlin and Hungary. Operations of this sort, unless carefully supervised and controlled by responsible political officers, could unwittingly involve the United States in a major international crisis, possibly in war. If this was not clear before the Bay of Pigs, it ought to be clear now.

The institutional danger here is readily apparent and has often been stated. As Professor Ransom puts it:

To mix the two functions—

That is, of information gathering and special operations—

involves the danger that foreign agents collecting facts and trying at the same time to bolster or cause the overthrow of a foreign government in America's apparent interest may develop a less than objective sense for distinguishing between fact and aspiration.

Messrs. Szulc and Meyer make the same point apropos of Cuba:

The CIA men were not only shaping, in effect, foreign policy, but were exempt from any meaningful outside checks on their activities. Indeed, they were in the enviable position of both organizing a clandestine operation and preparing the intelligence data through which the validity of the venture could be judged.

The obvious solution to this problem would, of course, be to deprive CIA entirely of its special operations function. Unfortunately the people in the most favorable position to collect clandestine information are often also the people best placed to engage in subversive political activities. In addition, a total divorce between the two functions might lead, in Ransom's words, to "competition, duplication, and even outright conflict."

For a time the Maxwell Taylor Committee, appointed by the President to inquire into the Bay of Pigs affair, appears to have toyed, at least, with an alternative idea—the idea of transferring the bulk of CIA's special operations to the Defense Department. But this solution would have had the equally obvious disadvantage of ensuring that the uniformed military—and hence the credit and prestige of the U.S. Government—would become involved as soon as any paramilitary operation became a matter of public knowledge.

In the event, it seems that routine covert operations have been left in the hands of CIA, with control to be transferred to the Pentagon only if a particular project becomes so big as to warrant open military participation. Mr. Hanson Baldwin in the New York Times summed up the matter thus:

The general rule of thumb for the future is that the CIA will not handle any primarily military operations, or ones of such size that they cannot be kept secret. However, each case will apparently be judged on its merits; there is no hard-and-fast formula that will put one operation under the CIA and another under the Pentagon."

All of us, I think, will agree that this is an area in which hard-and-fast formulas are not appropriate and in which, in the nature of things, organizational gimmicks cannot solve the major difficulties. As in the case of relations between CIA and the State Department, much depends on particular people and particular situations. But largely because the problem is of this sort, because it is a problem which can never finally be solved, I feel very strongly that continuing congressional surveillance is urgently required. If a joint committee had been in existence in the early stages of the first Cuban crisis, and if it had had cognizance of this matter, would the Bay of Pigs fiasco have occurred? I think it is at least possible that it would not.

Discussion of the Bay of Pigs leads me naturally to the third of the questions I think a joint committee might investigate: the whole question of recruitment and personnel within the intelligence community. For it seems to me perfectly clear that one of the things that went wrong with the abortive Cuban invasion—not the only thing, but one of the things—was that much of the CIA personnel responsible for the operation consisted of the sort of people who could not distinguish between the reactionary and the democratic elements in the anti-Castro camp, between the opponents of Castro who were acceptable to the Cuban people and those who, as former supporters of Batista, were anathema to them.

Let me quote again from Szulc and Meyer. In their book, "The Cuban Invasion," they write:

Thus the CIA established contacts in Miami with pro-Batista organizations and with exile groups whose entire political philosophy was dedicated to the return to the pre-Castro status quo in Cuba. . . . These factions were placing themselves not only against Castro but against history; whether or not the CIA operatives were aware that total regression is impossible, the contacts with the rightist factions ran counter to official U.S. policy, aimed at encouraging social reform in Latin America."

A few pages later they remark that the activities of the CIA agents reflected a desire to promote anti-Castro groups which they could manipulate. They continue:

It also reflected an attitude of hostility to left-of-center exile groups by second-rate field operatives. This in turn affected the top level of the agency and resulted in a lack of understanding at the top. It is not clear to what extent the CIA attitude was ideologically motivated or was simply a response based on the agent's view of what was practical or realistic.

This tendency on the part of the CIA to seek out and support the most anti-Communist groups in the field, regardless of whether or not such groups are politically viable, has of course been manifested on a number of other occasions—in Laos as well as in Cuba, and apparently in Algeria and the Congo as well. It is a persistent tendency, and one that on occasion has had a damaging effect on our policy. I suspect it has something to do with the kinds of people the Central Intelligence Agency gets to work for it.

Is it wise, for example, to rely to the extent CIA seems to do on the services of retired service officers? One would suppose that retired service officers, though almost always men of great ability, would have an instinctive tendency to take a rather narrow, strictly "operational" view of the problems confronting them. Similarly, is it wise to rely too heavily on the services of political exiles and refugees? It seems reasonable, for example, to suppose that an exile from Ruritania, especially someone who has passionate convictions about what course events in his homeland ought to take, may not be the best person to assess what course events in his homeland actually are taking, especially if what is actually happening is not to his taste.

Please do not misunderstand me. I do not mean to impugn the enormous amount of valuable work being done by retired service officers and by exiles and refugees in the CIA. Without their help, the organization simply could not function. Altogether the Central Intelligence Agency undoubtedly commands some of the ablest minds in the U.S. Government. And of course I do not mean for a moment to suggest that CIA should be staffed with "soft-liners" or people who have had no personal experience of the countries in question. That would be absurd.

But what I do think is that we have to be sure that what we are getting are actually the facts, and not what we would like to be the facts. This is not a matter of personal preference one way or the other. It is a matter of finding out what is actually taking place—and personal preferences enter only as they may color one's judgment. I suspect that the judgment of the CIA is sometimes colored by the preference of its employees. I suspect that CIA ought to take special care to recruit and employ men and women of widely differing backgrounds, temperaments, and opinions. I suspect that in these kinds of situations one gets at the truth only when a wide variety of inclinations is brought to bear. But remember that these are my feelings only. I have little data at my command. All I am saying is that I have a hunch that CIA recruitment policy has had an effect on CIA's performance. I may be wrong, but I submit that the only way we in Congress can find out is by ourselves conducting an inquiry into the subject.

The whole question of personnel and recruitment is, then, the third of the areas I would like to see a joint committee study. I would only add that of course no investigation need inquire into the names and histories of particular individuals involved; there need be no breaches of security or secrecy. The matter we are concerned with is one of general policy.

Finally, I want to turn to what is perhaps the most difficult of the four questions I referred to earlier: the question of how best to organize the evaluation of the enormous amount of material collected every day by the various agencies of the intelligence community. Obviously evaluation of some sort takes place at every echelon within the community, but I am particularly concerned

with the top-level U.S. intelligence Board and its auxiliary bodies.

Probably a few words are in order on how these agencies are organized. I think the following descriptions are roughly accurate, though the Central Intelligence Agency refused to provide me with authoritative information so I have had to rely on data from published sources.

By the phrase "intelligence community" I mean the numerous agencies within the executive branch concerned with intelligence collection and evaluation: the CIA, the new Defense Intelligence Agency, the State Department, RAND, and so on. The community as a whole is responsible for producing the national estimates—described by Professor Ransom as "these vital building blocks of national security policy." With the exception of the ultrasecret net estimates which are produced by special machinery within the National Security Council, most estimates are prepared under the aegis of the so-called Board of National Estimates.

This Board consists of a small number of intelligence experts—soldiers, diplomats, and scholars—who, to quote Ransom again, "preside as a kind of planning general staff for the intelligence community." The Board can initiate the preparation of an estimate, though it usually does so only on request from the President, the Director of Central Intelligence, or some other member of the National Security Council. In all cases, the Board of National Estimates sets the terms of reference, breaks the problem up into feasible components, and assigns appropriate tasks to the various agencies. The resulting staff studies are related by the small Office of National Estimates. The Board then drafts either a straight estimate—that is, one which attempts to assess a foreign nation's intentions or future policies with implicit assumptions as to future U.S. policy—or a general estimate—that is, one involving stated assumptions concerning possible changes in U.S. policy. After the draft estimate has been returned to the participating agencies for their comments and criticisms, it is submitted, possibly with dissent, to a committee which used to be known as the Intelligence Advisory Committee but is now named the U.S. Intelligence Board.

If the Board of Estimates is the planning board for the intelligence community, the Intelligence Board is its board of directors. As Ransom puts it, it is the "final forum for the professional intelligence community." It resolves jurisdictional disputes within the community and is finally responsible for forwarding the national estimates to the National Security Council. Invariably the attempt is made to produce agreed estimates, and usually the attempt is successful; but on occasion dissenting opinions will be submitted. The Intelligence Board meets usually once a week. It consists of the leading intelligence officials of the community and is chaired by the Director of Central Intelligence.

Two aspects of this process in particular are worth noting. The first is the central role of the Central Intelligence Agency. A high proportion of the intelligence community's fact gathering is done by CIA. The Board of National

14270

Estimates functions as a part of CIA. The chairman of the U.S. Intelligence Board is Director of CIA. And, of course, the intelligence community's spokesman on the National Security Council itself is also the CIA Director. The second thing worth noting, however, is the duality of CIA's role. Under the National Security Act the agency is not only one of the participants in the intelligence community, it is also the chief agency responsible for coordinating it. In other words, at many points in the process of evaluation, CIA is both player and umpire, both witness and judge. This ambiguity is implicit in the title of the Director who is formally not the "Director of the Central Intelligence Agency" but simply "Director of Central Intelligence."

Now the danger here is clear. It is that the Central Intelligence Agency will become—perhaps it has already become—not merely the chief intelligence agency but the dominant intelligence agency, and that it will develop persistent institutional tendencies, biases, and even policies. This type of problem is, of course, not peculiar to the American intelligence community but is characteristic of any complex administrative apparatus. That is the reason it has constantly to be guarded against.

Sherman Kent, a Yale professor and a World War II intelligence officer, put the point this way:

Almost any man or group of men confronted with the duty of getting something planned or getting something done will sooner or later hit upon what they consider a single most desirable course of action. Usually it is sooner; sometimes, under duress, it is a snap judgment of the top of the head. I cannot escape the belief that under the circumstances outlined, intelligence will find itself right in the middle of policy, and that upon occasions it will be the unabashed apologist for a given policy rather than its impartial and objective analyst.

Szulc and Meyer, writing of the Bay of Pigs, conclude:

Yet CIA was not behaving idiotically; it was in many senses responding to the insulated rationalism that infects a sheltered bureaucracy. Indeed, if there is an institutional villain, it is bureaucracy itself—that hulking, stubborn giant that seemingly can only look where it has been and not whither it is tending.

Professor Ransom calls it simply the problem of "feedback."

Naturally in the early months of 1961 the administration addressed itself to this problem. After the Bay of Pigs it could scarcely do otherwise. In particular it reactivated a watchdog group set up by President Eisenhower in 1956, originally called the President's Board of Consultants on Foreign Intelligence Activities and now named the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board. This Board, under the chairmanship of Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, studied the question of evaluation and apparently forwarded one or more reports to the President in the course of the year.

These reports have not been made public, but I think it is possible to piece together from newspaper reports roughly what happened. It seems that the Kil-

lian committee, or at least some of its members, were unhappy about the dual role being played by CIA. They proposed that in future the Director of CIA should be more of a technician, and that a new post should be created, probably attached to the White Houses, with some such title as "Coordinator of Intelligence," the new coordinator would be in a position to analyse and assess the results achieved by the intelligence community without having any bias in favor of CIA. Reports to this effect appeared frequently in the press in June and July 1961. In August Mr. Cabell Phillips of the New York Times stated that the new post had actually been offered to Mr. Fowler Hamilton.

Either these reports were inaccurate, or the administration changed its mind, or they could not find anyone to occupy the new post, because in September 1961 the President announced that Mr. John A. McCone had been named Director of Central Intelligence without any major change being made in the structure of the intelligence community. Subsequently, however, in January 1962 one such change was announced. Henceforth the Director of Central Intelligence was not to function both as Chairman of the U.S. Intelligence Board and also as CIA member of the Board. Instead, although the Director was to remain Chairman of the Board, his deputy was to act as representative of the CIA. In a letter to Mr. McCone, the President noted this change with approval. He added:

As head of the Central Intelligence Agency, while you will continue to have overall responsibility for the Agency, I shall expect you to delegate to your principal deputy, as you may deem necessary, so much of the direction of the detailed operation of the Agency as you may be required to permit you to carry out your primary task as Director of Central Intelligence.

Clearly there was a dilemma here. On the one hand, it was evident that CIA's intelligence gathering and operational functions could conflict with its coordinating function—and, of course, what was true of the Agency was also true of its Director. On the other hand, the President and his advisers were almost certainly aware that an independent coordinator, who was not himself the head of a major agency, might find himself weak, even powerless, in the face of the vast intelligence bureaucracies. Independence in theory might mean impotence in practice. So a compromise was struck, and the duties of the Director of Central Intelligence merely redefined.

How successful this compromise has been it is probably too early to say. But from all that I have said, it ought to be obvious that the problem of evaluation, like the other problems I have already mentioned, is a continuing one, and not one that can be spirited out of existence by merely institutional gimmickry. It is also obvious that the problem of evaluation is an enormously important problem, probably the most important confronting the intelligence community. For these reasons, I think that it, too, should be a continuing subject of scrutiny by a well-qualified and well-staffed committee of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to detain the House further. I have spoken at considerable length, yet I am only too well aware that I have only skimmed the surface of this extraordinarily complicated and difficult subject. There are any number of further questions that I might have posed—for example, concerning the apparently increasing concentration of authority within the intelligence community, or about the role of the U.S. Information Agency. And, of course, I must repeat that this has been essentially an outsider's analysis. I have been trying merely to suggest what kinds of inquiry a joint committee might undertake, not to anticipate what the results of those inquiries would be.

Nor as I remarked at the outset, do I wish to insist that the resolution I am introducing today provides the only possible way of proceeding. Perhaps the joint committee should be given rather different terms of reference. Or perhaps a body should be established comprising private citizens as well as Members of Congress. I do not want to be dogmatic about this. My purpose in speaking today has been to reopen public discussion of an issue that has too long been dormant, and moreover to reopen it at a time of relative tranquillity, when the intelligence community is not in the public spotlight, at a time therefore when these matters can be considered soberly and dispassionately.

But we in Congress should not be too timid about putting ourselves forward. I wonder how many Members of this House are aware of the enormous body of opinion in favor of the creation of a congressional joint committee. Both the Hoover Commission and its special intelligence task force favored congressional intervention. The New York Times has consistently supported the idea in its editorial columns. Two years ago the distinguished military analyst, Mr. Hanson Baldwin, stated that one of the lessons to be drawn from the Bay of Pigs was "the necessity of keeping all secret intelligence activities and operations under constant top-echelon surveillance and review." He noted that the machinery for achieving this would be greatly strengthened by the creation of a joint congressional watchdog committee.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote just once more from the writings of Professor Harry Howe Ransom who, as I have already said, is our country's leading lay student of intelligence affairs. I think his comment deserves all the greater consideration because it comes from a member of the political science profession—a profession which, as we all know, has always had a strong bias in favor of the executive branch of government. On page 206 of "Central Intelligence and National Security" Professor Ransom remarks:

It is common experience for security policymakers, military and civilian, to find their fear of congressional interference changed into gratitude for congressional support, frequently more effective support than has been accorded on the executive side of Government. No executive agency today reveals everything to congressional committees with jurisdiction over its operations. Officials of central intelligence may be ex-

pected, to reveal even less. But more advantages are to be gained than lost from establishing a more institutionalized system for congressional surveillance.

I agree with that, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that what I have said today will be given earnest and thoughtful attention by my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks. I think we should have had a joint committee to monitor the CIA when it was first established. I have had a little experience in the matter as a member of the Committee on Armed Services. As you may know, we have a subcommittee on the CIA. I was a member of that committee for either 2 or 4 years. We met annually—one time a year, for a period of 2 hours in which we accomplished virtually nothing. I think a proposal such as you have made is the answer to it because a part-time subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, as I say, which meets for just 2 hours, 1 day a year, accomplishes nothing whatsoever. I want to compliment the gentleman on his proposal.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman from Oregon and appreciate the contribution he has made. He knows where in he talks. He is an expert on the subject and is a member of the Committee on Armed Services and was a member of the subcommittee supervising the CIA—in theory—and what he says dovetails entirely and agrees with the experience, and the statements made in the other body as well.

(Mr. LINDSAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. LINDSAY) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY], on the step he has taken in introducing his resolution. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] has taken the initiative in remedying a serious inadequacy in our foreign policy making process. His efforts merit our thoughtful attention and solid support.

I have joined the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] in filing a companion resolution which, by establishing a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence, would fill what is now a gaping hole in the congressional mechanism for the formulation of foreign policy. At present, intelligence matters are handled simultaneously by several committees on both sides of Capitol Hill. Not only confusion but omission as well result from this decentralization of supervision. Our proposals, which would apply to any intelligence or information agency, not only the CIA, would remedy this situation.

First, the proposed joint committee would give Congress the machinery it must have to exercise its responsibility for the oversight of the Nation's intelligence activities. The present lack of

congressional supervision in this area is itself a serious omission in view of the work required of the foreign policy committees of both Houses. A variety of congressional committees now handles the Nation's everwidening range of intelligence activities. Effective coordination of congressional supervision is impossible.

The proposed committee would have a comprehensive view of the intelligence and information aspects of foreign affairs. A single committee of this nature would provide the existing foreign policy committees with more direct and efficient service. The agencies under its supervision would benefit as well. A prime target of the joint committee's efforts would be the improvement of their operations and policies. Studies of the agencies' problems and programs would, of course, be considerably more extensive and complete when conducted by a committee with single responsibility of intelligence oversight.

Ultimately, I believe, both Houses of Congress would benefit from the establishment of the proposed joint committee. The Senate and House would be afforded a broader opportunity for careful consideration of foreign information and intelligence matters. The agencies involved would similarly benefit from the committee's studies and recommendations.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I hope the House may act promptly on our proposal. It would fill a vital gap in our foreign policymaking process. It would streamline existing efforts in the areas of foreign information and intelligence. This is an area in which congressional responsibility is long overdue.

ESTABLISHING MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR OPERATION OF CIVIL SUPERSONIC AIRCRAFT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. ROYBAL). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation designed to deal with a most serious problem which will confront our Nation in the very near future. Specifically, Mr. Speaker, my legislation would establish certain limits of tolerance associated with the advent of the supersonic civil transport plane now being developed by aircraft manufacturers in France and England and being purchased by several American airlines. Similar efforts to develop a supersonic transport are now underway in the United States.

This is a problem which we no longer can ignore. I have introduced this legislation at this particular time, in order to give airplane manufacturers both in our own country and abroad ample opportunity to make sufficient changes in the design of their powerplants to avoid future distress to millions of Americans. The supersonic jet powerplant of the future must be developed and designed with appropriate consideration for noise abatement.

This is far-reaching legislation. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we can no

longer ignore this problem. The United States and the entire world failed to properly plan ahead in the development of our present subsonic jet transports and, as a result, millions of people throughout the world have had their lives drastically changed by the unbearable noise which today's jet transports produce at airfields near large urban areas.

My own district lies just east of O'Hare Field, the world's busiest airport. It would be literally impossible for me to fully describe the deafening noise which thousands of my constituents suffer everyday from conventional subsonic jets either arriving or departing O'Hare Field. It cannot be said that these people shouldn't have built near the airport; these people were there before the airport was built.

I believe it is tragic that airplane manufacturers of the world did not take these consequences into consideration when they developed the subsonic jet transport during the past decade.

I was not a Member of Congress in those days, but I feel it is not only my duty but the duty of every Member of this Congress both in the House and in the Senate to recognize the fact that we cannot repeat this error on the threshold of the supersonic air transport era.

FAA

We must do everything possible to insure that this new type of supersonic aircraft—which is being developed from scratch—does not repeat the tragic mistake of its subsonic jet predecessor, FAA.

The legislation which I have introduced today would prohibit the operation of any civil supersonic aircraft in air transportation through the navigable airspace of the United States which would generate sonic boom overpressures exceeding 1.5 pounds per square foot on the ground directly beneath the flight path.

This legislation would further make it unlawful to operate any civil supersonic aircraft into or out of U.S. airports unless it can be demonstrated that ground noise level generated by such civil supersonic aircraft is substantially lower than that generated by long range subsonic jet aircraft.

I am not at all persuaded by the argument that you cannot stop progress. Certainly we all are for progress. But we cannot blindly state that we are for progress when we know that such progress can seriously impair the health and emotional stability of great numbers of Americans. Nor can we say blindly we are for progress when we are faced with the prospect of seeing huge belts of destruction criss-crossing the United States from sonic booms generated by supersonic aircraft.

It is my belief, that unless Congress deals with this subject matter at this time, we may conceivably see such havoc wrought upon this country from sonic booms that millions of dollars in damage to property and a serious threat to the health of many of our people may ensue.

My bill limits sonic boom overpressures not to exceed 1.5 pounds per square foot on the ground directly beneath the flight path.

August 15

The best available information on sonic booms indicates that anything under 1 pound per square foot in overpressure by a supersonic aircraft flying at an altitude of 70,000 feet creates no damage to ground structures and no significant public reaction. Anything under 1.5 pounds per square foot in overpressure creates no damage to ground structures but does produce some probability of public reaction to moderate sonic booms. Overpressures between 1.5 pounds per square foot and 2 pounds per square foot produce significant public reaction day and night but no damage to ground structures.

I hope my colleagues from the rural areas will take into account the fact that sonic booms which create significant public reaction day and night in this category will also have significant reaction on farm livestock.

Overpressures exceeding 2 pounds per square foot but under 3 pounds per square foot at an altitude of 70,000 feet create damage to glass and plaster and produce widespread public reaction day and night. Overpressures exceeding 3 pounds per square foot produce widespread window and plaster damage, minor structural damage to frame and walls, and profound public reaction.

The U.S. Air Force can produce significant figures showing damage claims paid by our Government for losses due to sonic booms created by our military aircraft. You will note that my bill does not apply to military aircraft because we can certainly recognize the fact that in the area of national defense, we must be prepared to suffer some discomfort.

Furthermore, the Air Force has carried on an intensive program of rigid control in the production of sonic booms so that every effort has been made to keep the damage to a minimum. I am sure this will not be the case when private airlines begin competing against each other with supersonic air transports.

The other part of my proposal today would prohibit flights of civil supersonic aircraft into or out of U.S. airports unless it can be demonstrated that ground noise generated by such supersonic aircraft is substantially lower than that generated by present long-range subsonic jet aircraft.

At first blush this may seem like a harsh and unreasonable proposal, but I hope those who would criticize this proposal will take into consideration the fact that we are now only on the threshold in the development of supersonic airframes and powerplants. Unlike the development of the subsonic jet transport, which was developed in the first instance as part of the military defense system when no consideration was given to noise levels in the development of powerplants, in the development of supersonic powerplants we have time and we know from experience the necessity for taking noise into consideration in the development of such powerplants.

This legislation is designed to put the whole airplane industry, both in the United States and in other nations of the world, on notice that the people of the United States do not intend to perpetuate the folly of permitting air transports to

be developed with no consideration being given to noise abatement.

There is no logical reason why the development of supersonic air transports for civilian use must be based on some foolish notion that a race exists between developer nations. I am more interested in which nation will be first to develop a supersonic civilian transport which meets the standards of noise abatement rather than which nation develops a supersonic transport which will actually knock the world's brains out with deafening noise. I am convinced the nation which develops a relatively quiet supersonic transport will ultimately get most of the world's business.

The city of San Francisco recently recognized the tremendous noise problems that supersonic air transports will produce. Belford Brown, manager of the San Francisco International Airport, in a letter dated July 18, 1963, to Mr. Robert Murray, Jr., vice president of Pan American World Airways, stated San Francisco's concern regarding the supersonic aircraft noise problem. This letter should be of particular interest since San Francisco has in the past adhered to a policy of no operational restrictions on air carriers.

Mr. Brown wrote as follows:

Recent publications within the air transportation industry and nationwide newspaper reporting indicate that Pan American World Airways is contemplating the purchase of Concorde supersonic commercial transports which have been developed by the Anglo-French combine. The airport department at San Francisco understands from the planners of one European supersonic airport that the landing configuration of this particular aircraft is such that it is expected to create a noise level approximately 16 decibels higher than now being experienced by American subsonic jet aircraft.

As president of the San Francisco Sound Abatement Center you are aware of the noise problems and community resistance to the airport's operation at San Francisco International Airport and of the legal actions now pending and in the hands of our legal counsel. You are also aware that San Francisco International Airport has never instituted an operational restriction on the air carriers or aircraft operating into and out of San Francisco International Airport. We have relied wholly upon our preferential runway systems, airport runway extensions, and community enlightenment on noise through the sound abatement center.

On July 9, 1963, the Public Utilities Commission of the City and County of San Francisco passed Resolution No. 23074 (copy attached hereto) setting forth the city's official position concerning supersonic transport planning. In effect, it states (1) that supersonic jet transports should be able to operate from the existing and currently planned major civil air terminals; (2) that the design of these transports should require no greater landing or takeoff distances than present-day subsonic jet aircraft; and (3) that the ground level noise created by supersonic jet transports should be no greater in the airport environs than the levels now being experienced.

The purpose of this communication is to advise Pan American World Airways of the city's official position in this matter, and further, to inform you that if facts stated in this communication as to the noise characteristics of the Concorde are correct, we will have to forgo our previous policy and give serious consideration to imposing oper-

ating requirements which will control the noise levels of aircraft operating in and out of San Francisco International Airport.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to call particular attention to the statement which indicates that supersonic aircraft are expected to create a noise level approximately 16 decibels higher than now being experienced by American subsonic jet aircraft. This is incredible. This 16 decibel increase is like firing a cannon next to a 22-caliber rifle. I submit that if Congress fails to adopt this legislation or some similar restrictions on the degree of noise level which we will tolerate at our major airfields from supersonic aircraft, we will be creating an absolutely inhuman situation for thousands upon thousands of families living in the vicinity of America's major airfields. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that a 16-decibel increase over the present level of noise generated by a landing jet, will create conditions which will be completely unbearable to the human ear and brain. I submit this situation, if true, could have serious psychological effects on vast numbers of Americans.

Subsonic jets now operating in this country produce noise levels both on departure and arrival dangerously close to the maximum human tolerance of perceived noise decibels. To permit the operation of supersonic transports which will produce noise 16 decibels higher than now being experienced by American subsonic jet aircraft is, in my judgment, Mr. Speaker, to invite disaster for large segments of our American population.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, this is a problem which must be dealt with by the Federal Government. It is not fair to leave to the individual airports of America the responsibility of developing their own respective standards.

Such a policy could bring about a wide divergence of rules and regulations and standards which could affect the entire configuration of air travel in America. I believe in fairness to all the major airfields of this Nation. The Congress should establish one uniform standard. This would insure against unnecessary economic pressures upon the individual airport operators.

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter which we can no longer ignore. Continental Airlines recently signed a \$30 million-plus contract to purchase three British-French mach 2.2 jet airliners which, when delivered, will provide the first supersonic service within the United States. These supersonic transports would be capable of flying from Los Angeles to Chicago in less than 2 hours.

This is the second supersonic air transport order placed by an American firm. Pan American World Airways ordered six similar planes for use on its overseas routes.

It is estimated that the first Concorde ordered by Continental should make its maiden flight in 1966, with delivery date in 1969. The Concorde is a joint venture between France's Sud Aviation and England's British Aircraft Corp. It will carry 104 passengers at speeds up to 1,450 miles per hour.

which is, but among which is "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

We cannot legislate freedom, since it is a gift of God by virtue of the fact that we are created by Him in His image with dignity. But we can and do legislate to limit freedom and in a sense legislation in this area is necessary to a degree in a society as complex as ours. We must, however, be extremely careful lest we go so far in the direction of limitations that we, created by God to be free, become slaves to a political state which to those who seek only material gain becomes a substitute for Almighty God who alone is the giver of life and bread. In creating a body of laws to limit freedom, how be it honorable our intent may be, we are always in danger of creating a Frankenstein that will become our master rather than our servant.

I am not a lawyer but I am sure that many who would agree with me that an interpretation of the law may be technically correct and yet result in a moral wrong. I wonder whether we have not come to a point in our great and thrilling history at which we may find that in our own wisdom we have denied the wisdom of God. We are beginning to interpret out of existence by the very laws we have written, the foundation upon which that body of law rests—faith in Almighty God. How long can we nibble away at ourselves before we destroy ourselves?

Faith and freedom as we know it—or them—are inseparable. This Nation was built upon the principle that man should be free to approach his God and not that he should be denied the right to approach Him. Ours is historically the philosophy of "freedom of"—not "freedom from."

We are at a crucial point in history. We must not make legal technicalities to destroy moral foundations. Faith in God and the expression of it belongs to the people—not to Congress nor to the Supreme Court. If the Supreme Court has judged that our present law does not permit, because of a technicality, the official recognition of God in public schools and gatherings then we who make the laws have an obligation to the people to protect their moral rights.

CALL FOR CLOSER CHECK ON CUBAN REFUGEES COMING INTO THIS COUNTRY

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago I expressed dismay over the fact that Castro had been given the right to select half of the refugees coming into the United States since the quarantine in October of 1962 and exposed the fact that some 2,000 refugees had thus been handpicked by Castro and all but 20 had been admitted to the United States.

The State Department in its admission that this was true said that it was "academic."

At the time I cautioned against Castro's opportunity as the result of this

irresponsible and silly arrangement to infiltrate the entire refugee freedom fighter effort to oust the Communists from Cuba—and to carry on any other spy purpose desired by Castro in this country—by shipping in Castro Cuban spies.

Proof that this apprehension and for calling this to the attention of the House is well founded is contained in an article analyzing Castro's spy network in the United States that appeared in the Miami Herald on September 8 in which it was exposed that more than 150 Cubans suspected of being Castro agents and hard-core Communists have been discovered and ordered out of the United States—an many more are suspected as the result of the efforts of the FBI.

It is high time that closer scrutinizing of all refugees coming into this country from Cuba be made to guarantee against such spy activities—a demand I made many months ago and which I renew today—and that more deals or accommodations be made with Castro—with regards to refugees or any other matter.

The article to which I referred, follows:

FBI BEEFS UP MIAMI STAFF—CASTRO'S SPY NETWORK REACHES DEEP IN UNITED STATES (By Dom Bonafede)

U.S. agencies dealing with internal security conceded Saturday that the long fingers of Fidel Castro's spy network reach into every facet of the Cuban exile movement.

More than 150 Cubans suspected of being Castro agents or hard-core Communists have been ordered to leave the United States or face indefinite detention. And the movements of many others are watched daily by Federal investigators.

To cope with the spy threat, the Miami office of the FBI has vastly expanded its staff—how much is unknown, since the Bureau follows a rigid policy of secrecy in such matters.

Nevertheless, Miami FBI Chief Wesley G. Grapp acknowledged, "The work ties up a lot of our manpower."

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has underlined the menace declaring: "We have to be constantly alert that an individual who alleges to be a refugee, under severe pressure by Castro, who has had to leave his home and had his property confiscated, may in fact be a spy."

Federal officials agree there are very many Castro informers in the United States but are reluctant to estimate their numbers.

Their hesitation is based on the fact that most of Castro's fifth columnists are unschooled, nonprofessional informers without backgrounds in espionage. As a result, they are difficult to trace.

U.S. security officers are confident they can weed out the indoctrinated, well-trained Cuban agents.

"To the best of our knowledge, very few competent Castro agents have gotten past our screening," declared Joseph Minton, assistant director of the Miami office of the U.S. Immigration Service.

The so-called amateurs, for the most part zealous revolutionary sympathizers, form the bulk of Castro's spy corps.

This follows a definite pattern in Communist Cuba, since recruiting of the unskilled to perform skilled tasks is characteristic of Castro's revolution.

Fernando Fernandez, recently accused of being a Castro informer (he denied it) is a prime example of the untrained, unsophisticated possible spy. He attempted to send information to Carlos Lechuga, the "Cuban ambassador to Mexico."

Lechuga, it so happens, is the Cuban Ambassador to the United Nations and has been for more than a year.

The Fernandez case is a relatively minor footnote in the history of Cuban espionage in the United States. But it has served to point up the existence of Castro's intelligence operation—loose and untidy as it may be.

Earl E. T. Smith, former U.S. Ambassador to Cuba, maintains Castro was successful in planting espionage agents in the Cuban Embassy in Washington before he rode to power January 1, 1959.

These agents kept Castro, then in the Sierra Maestra, fully informed and brought anti-Batista pressure to bear on the State Department, according to Smith.

IN OTHER CASE HISTORIES

Castro has publicly boasted that he knew in advance of April 17, 1961, Bay of Pigs invasion: FBI officers in November, 1962, smashed a ring of pro-Castro terrorists, including several attached to the Cuban U.N. mission, who were plotting a wave of sabotage in New York and New Jersey; Pedro Rieg, Castro diplomat who defected, disclosed that the commercial affairs section of the Cuban Embassy in Mexico City was "devoted not to commerce but to espionage and Communist infiltration."

Refugees arriving in Miami have reported that "spy training camps" have been established in Cuba.

And more than one anti-Castro raid has been called off because it became apparent informers tipped off the Castro regime.

U.S. investigators contend that not all of Castro's "eyes and ears" are exiles, but include Cuban born nationalized citizens and Americans sympathetic to the Cuban revolution.

Members of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and Prensa Latina, Castro's news service, are frequently under surveillance. Francisco Portela, a U.S. citizen who served as Prensa Latina's chief correspondent, was indicted in December 1961 for failure to register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act. Prensa Latina subsequently entered a plea of nolo contendere and was fined \$2,000.

The majority of suspected Castro agents are nabbed during screening by immigration officials at the Opa-locka Air Base.

In many instances, investigators have obtained a line on each refugee from inside Cuba. For an unexplained reason, female refugees are released after routine questioning at the point of entry but all males are required to remain overnight at Opa-locka and submit to an extensive interrogation.

Assisting the immigration officials are other Cuban exiles, who are experienced in anti-Communist security work and intimately acquainted with Castro's cadre of informants.

These exiles, as well as others who voluntarily aid in the detection of Castro spies, are paid out of a "confidential fund" made available to most U.S. security agencies.

One of the Immigration Service's most valuable spotters is a former high-ranking Cuban police officer, reputed to possess a dossier on almost every Communist or fellow traveler in Cuba.

Refugees believed to be loyal Castroites are sent to the Federal Detention center at Tampa and given the choice of remaining in custody indefinitely or returning to Cuba or any other country that will have them.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight Friday, September 13, to file a report, including the separate minority views on H.R. 8363.

1963

15833

Chairman Hardy and Admiral Stephens at the trawler investigation:

Chairman HARDY. At the time that two Japs visited the Department of State on the morning of December 7, 1941, it was presumed that they were honest and that there wasn't anything going on that was prejudicial to the security of the United States. Isn't that so?

Admiral STEPHENS. This is correct, sir. Chairman HARDY. Then we get ourselves in one awful mess by accepting at face value this kind of a presumption, and you are making the presumption all on the side of the Russians.

Now, no one is saying that the Russians are going to use these trawlers to launch a military attack, although we do not know. But they certainly are not just fishing. If anyone wants to make any presumptions, it might be wise and in the interest of our national security to presume that the trawlers are being used as radio relay points for spy activity in this country, that they are mapping our coastline, listening in on our military and civilian communications, carrying agents to or from Cuba or even the United States, or any number of other espionage activities. Any one of which would rule out "innocent" passage.

The point of all this, of course, is not whether Russian trawlers should be permitted within our 3-mile limit, or within 12 or 15 miles of our coast but rather whenever any Soviet vessel, trawler, freighter or naval ship comes anywhere near our shores in our own waters or international waters it should immediately be placed under surveillance.

To do less is to invite trouble, and we cannot afford to gamble with our national security.

JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE TO SUPERVISE ACTIVITIES OF THE CIA

(Mr. RYAN of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, over 2 years ago I addressed the House and urged the prompt consideration of my bill to create a joint congressional committee to supervise the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency. At that time there was a great hue and cry for an investigation of the CIA in the wake of the disaster of the Bay of Pigs. As so often happens, the furor over the abortive Cuban affair subsided and so did criticism of the CIA. The Cuban fiasco was the consequence of permitting a secret Government organization, which is not subject to the usual congressional scrutiny, to conduct its own foreign policy. There is a saying that those who do not learn from history are doomed to repeat it.

Now we have reports that the CIA is once more involved in policymaking—this time in South Vietnam. As we know, the South Vietnam Government has been engaged in suppressing its own people through a campaign of religious persecution. On August 21 this campaign resulted in a series of ruthless and bloody raids on Buddhist pagodas. These raids were carried out by the special forces of

Col. Le Quang Tung. According to yesterday's New York Times, the CIA pays as "direct under-the-table aid" \$3 million a year for the salaries and maintenance of these forces. Although these forces, under the direct control of South Vietnam's strong man, Ngo Dinh Nhu, are carrying out the policy of religious persecution, the New York Times reports that the CIA last week decided to continue the \$250,000 monthly payments to these troops.

Mr. Speaker, it is incredible that the CIA is supporting the very forces in South Vietnam which are undermining U.S. policy. President Kennedy has pointed out that the campaign of religious persecution is not the way to win in that area.

The role of the CIA in South Vietnam again demonstrates that vital necessity of a congressional watchdog committee over the CIA. The operations of the CIA are not being scrutinized by the Congress. Even its budget is concealed from almost every Representative and Senator. The CIA has consistently overstepped its role as an intelligence-gathering agency by engaging in policy formulation and execution. It is in essence a secret government. The existence of a secret government is totally inconsistent with our democratic values and procedures. I again urge the adoption of my resolution—House Joint Resolution 145—calling for the establishment of a joint congressional watchdog committee over the CIA. It is time for Congress to make the CIA accountable for its actions.

PRAYER AND BIBLE READING IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

(Mr. BECKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include a resolution.)

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of the House well know, there are 57 Members of this body who introduced resolutions to amend the Constitution of the United States to permit prayer in public schools and Bible reading and to provide against further litigation in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, the 57 Members who have introduced these resolutions appointed 6 Members—the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING], the gentlemen from Florida [Mr. CRAMER and Mr. FUQUA], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTAL], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY], and myself—to act as a committee to draw up an amendment which we could all support rather than having 57 different resolutions. That amendment is now prepared and has been approved not only by the 6 Members of the House acting as a committee, but many of the 57 Members who have introduced resolutions. We are introducing the joint resolution today.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting a copy of the resolution in the RECORD at this point so that every Member can read it and understand it and know when they sign the discharge petition that this is the one which will be substituted for House Joint Resolution 407 under discharge

petition No. 3. All Members can now sign the discharge petition knowing just what the amendment will do.

The resolution referred to follows:

H. RES. 407

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit the offering, reading from, or listening to prayers or biblical scriptures, if participation therein is on a voluntary basis, in any governmental or public school, institution, or place.

"SEC. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit making reference to belief in, reliance upon, or invoking the aid of, God or a Supreme Being, in any governmental or public document, proceeding, activity, ceremony, school, institution, or place or upon any coinage, currency, or obligation of the United States.

"SEC. 3. Nothing in this article shall constitute an establishment of religion.

"SEC. 4. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

RESOLUTION TO REFER THE ISSUE OF PRAYER AND BIBLE READING IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND PUBLIC GATHERINGS TO THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

(Mr. SCHADEBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution to refer the issue of prayer and Bible reading in public schools and public gatherings to the people of the United States. Freedom does not just happen. If it is to survive men must be willing to live for it as well as to die for it. The service dead who sleep beneath the hallowed ground in our Nation's burying places bear silent yet vivid testimony that freedom is indeed costly. They did not die to give us freedom—they gave their lives to give us the opportunity to pursue freedom. In a sense they have said, "We have done what we could." It is now up to us. There are countless other numbers who sleep beneath the sod who also have given their lives for freedom's cause, making sacrifices as civilians matching those made by others in uniform.

Our political forefathers made it abundantly clear in many of their writings, some of which are now historic documents that God created man to be free; that He indeed intended every man whom He created to be endowed with certain unalienable rights, among which, but may I point out not the extent of

The Mythology of the CIA ^{AC mkt.} By Richard Starnes



IN the mythology of bureaucracy, the Central Intelligence Agency has come to occupy an awesomely special place.

In any effective sense of the word as used in a democracy, the CIA's accountability is so vague and amorphous as to be meaningless. The face it turns toward the public when it is under criticism is one of sad virtue: CIA, so goes the myth, does not reply to attacks, does not deny stories (however outlandish—or true—they may be), is above the hurly-burly of democracy in action.

This, of course, is disingenuous nonsense. The CIA does reply to criticism, violently and vociferously. It does deny and attempt to discredit stories that seek to penetrate its cloak of piety. It moves heaven and earth to unmask the sources of news accounts that shake its cloudy complacency.

Sadly enough, the prevailing mythology of the CIA is perpetuated and, in a sense, codified in "The Craft of Intelligence" (Harper and Row), by Allen Dulles, who for eight years headed the huge spy apparatus.

In defending its unique lack of accountability to any of the traditional organs of democracy, apologists for the CIA invariably fall back on the refrain that its failures too often become public, while its triumphs must remain secret. For example, in attempting to counter some of the "myths" that he finds harmful to the CIA, Mr. Dulles writes:

"I have frequently been asked what 'myth' about the CIA has been the most harmful. . . (I) finally chose the accusation that CIA made foreign policy, often cut across the programs laid down by the President and Secretary of State, and interfered with what ambassadors and Foreign Service officers abroad were trying to do.

"The charge is untrue but extremely hard to disprove without revealing classified information. It is all the harder to disprove."

and at times has even been spread by people in government who themselves are not 'in the know.'

It seems possible that Mr. Dulles himself was not always in the know. He was, for example, director of the CIA when the then Ambassador to Cuba, Earl E. T. Smith, endured at the hands of CIA officers attached to his embassy the very things that Mr. Dulles now claims are untrue. Unhappily for the credibility of his book, Mr. Dulles does not allude to Ambassador Smith's charges (sworn to before a Senate committee and later included in a book), beyond the flat assertion that such charges are always false.

(In my own experience, strikingly similar charges were made to me by unassailable American sources in Saigon. When my dispatch containing the charges was printed, it forever demolished the carefully-nurtured folkway that the CIA disdains to reply to criticism. The CIA's response was loud, anguished and protracted, altho clandestine. It also made vigorous attempts to learn the identity of the sources of the story.)

The thoughtful reader is bound to be troubled by some of the contradictions contained in the former CIA chief's account of his stewardship of the twilight world of spooks. He opposes the establishment of a Congressional watchdog committee to oversee the CIA in the manner that the Joint Congressional Atomic Committee keeps tabs on the AEC, but he contends that Congress exercise close control of the CIA thru its power to make or withhold appropriations.

He insists that he has never known a member of Congress to betray a CIA secret, so it is clear that his opposition to a watchdog committee is not based on security considerations. As to what it is based on, unfortunately, Mr. Dulles is not clear.

In sum, the former CIA chief seems to have had considerable trouble in reconciling the function of the huge spy bureaucracy with the needs and obligations of a free and open society. It is a problem that profoundly troubles anyone who gives it much thought.

FASHION ACCESSORIES

ELYSIAN HOSIERY. See Improved For Release 2005/06/06 : CIA-RDP71B00364R000600100006-5
Med. length. Fashion colors..... 3 pr., 1.99
ORLON® AND WOOL KNEE HIGH SOCKS, Comp. value
1.50 to 2.50. Asst. colors.....pr. \$1
FASHION JEWELRY. Comp. values \$2 to \$5*.
Tailored and stone sets.....1.59 ea.; 2 for \$3*
HAND MADE ITALIAN TOYS. Detailed character
dolls. Limited quantities..... 2.99
NATURAL MINK PETER PAN COLLARS, from our reg-
ular Fall Collection. F St. 24 pieces, S. S. 10;
VA. 16; P. G. P. 12; M. H. 10..... \$11*
IMPORTED ACRYLIC GLOVES, warm, easy to launder.
Will not shrink, assorted colors.....pr. 87c
IMPORTED DRESS LEATHER LINED GLOVES. Comp.
value 6.50. Knit linings.....pr. 4.90
FAMOUS MAKE ORLON ACRYLIC DRESSMAKER SWEAT-
ERS. New fall colors. Sizes 34 to 40 in the 3.99
group

STREET FLOOR SAVINGS

PLASTIC HANGERS. Reg. 8 for \$1. No snag. 16 for 79c
COMBINATION PLASTIC HANGER FOR LADIES'
SUITS. Reg. 4 for \$1..... 8 for 79c
PLASTIC STACK-UP SHOE BOXES. Reg. \$1 ea.
See-thru for easy selections..... 2 for 79c
KLEINERTS' PLASTIC MAKE-UP AND LINGERIE ACCES-
SORIES. Reg. 2.50-\$3..... \$1
35MM SLIDE PROJECTOR. Blower cooled. Reg.
29.98..... 24.88

WHITE HANDKERCHIEFS..... Cottons. Comp. 19c
values 35c-50c.....
JEWELRY SETS. Discontinued styles. Tie bar or pin-up
and matching links. Comp. values 2.95-3.95..... \$1*
JEWELRY SEPARATES, cuff links, tie bars, pin-ups.
Discontinued patterns..... 59c*
*plus f. e. t.

APPLIANCES, RADIO, T.V.

GE 23" UHF/VHF LOBOY TELEVISION, mahogany
finish. Just 10..... \$199
RCA VICTOR COLOR TELEVISION CONSOLE, 265
square inch picture. Just 8..... \$448
TONECREST STEREO CONSOLE OR COFFEE TABLE,
mahogany finish..... 94.88
ALUMINUM STORM/SCREEN WINDOWS, year
'round. Min. order 5 windows up to 101
united inches. Installed.....each 11.99
ALUMINUM STORM/SCREEN DOORS, full length
piano hinge with 2-screen, 2-glass inserts.
Installation at small extra charge..... 22.66
ALL PURPOSE CABINET, for storage, end tables.
Walnut or mahogany..... 7.99
6-TRANSISTOR RADIO, complete with case, battery
and earphone..... 6.39
COMPACT HOME FREEZERS 3½ cu. ft., stores 112-
lbs. food..... \$114
GE 10-LB. AUTOMATIC CLOTHES DRYER, big capacity.
One at each store..... \$98
GLASS-LINED WATER HEATERS, 30-gal. capacity. New
..... \$48

September 10

A5688

nam Special Forces that conducted the raids on Buddhist pagodas. Yet this is, unfortunately, not the first time the Government has been made to look foolish by the misnamed Central Intelligence Agency. And the trouble is precisely that the CIA does not confine itself to gathering intelligence but has been given operational responsibility for tasks for which it has debatable competence.

One might have supposed that the Bay of Pigs debacle would have alerted the White House to the risks of allowing an intelligence agency to sit in judgment on its own operational missions. The temptation is strong to tailor intelligence to support preconceived opinion. Moreover, when the CIA invests its prestige in supporting a given course, there is an all-too-human tendency to seek vindication for a commitment of money and judgment.

This seems to lie behind the present mud-dle over CIA misadventures in Saigon. The agency's mission chief in that country had established close and cordial relations with Ngo Dinh Nhu, President Diem's brother and sponsor of the Special Forces. Some \$3 million a year was earmarked for helping the Special Forces. But reportedly the CIA had no advance warning that the Forces would invade the pagodas and the initial intelligence reaction was confused—contributing to the confusion in Washington over what transpired that fateful day.

Nevertheless, the payments evidently continued in the face of Government policy to the contrary, and the administration has been reduced to a stutter in trying to explain what has happened. Ironically, notwithstanding the CIA subsidy, the pro-Diem press in Saigon has been bitterly attacking the American agency for allegedly taking part in an attempted coup against the regime.

Let it be said that the CIA contains men of undoubted skill and patriotism. Let it also be said that much of the American problem in Saigon springs out of circumstances that not even the wisest of men could easily meet. But some self-inflicted wounds form part of the heartbreaking calamity. In the past, there has been a distressing tendency to subordinate political to military considerations and to avert the eyes from unpleasant realities. The CIA, while not alone in this failing, was unable to provide a detached intelligence corrective because its own agents were enmeshed in the operations of the regime.

There are many rueful lessons in the South Vietnamese tragedy, and not the least of them is that it makes sense in every respect to divorce intelligence from operations that belong in the military sphere. It would be heartening if the present embarrassment were turned to useful purpose by effecting a real reorganization of the CIA. The opportunity should have been grasped after the Cuban invasion; if nothing is done now, both the country and the agency may be needlessly humiliated again.

Need for Governors on Automobiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, recently a former native of South Dakota wrote a letter to the editor which was printed in the Sunday, August 18, issue of the Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Argus Leader. The author, Dr. Adrian H. Scolten, presents some interesting viewpoints and I ask

unanimous consent that his letter be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR GOVERNORS ON CARS

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ARGUS-LEADER:

America has not even begun to solve the problem of our unnecessary injuries and deaths caused by cars and trucks. Nobody need be injured or killed in traffic, but it happens on our roads and streets every hour of the day. Something more drastic must be done to stop this.

No adults, children or teenagers need be killed by cars, but nobody seems to care until it is his son or daughter, or other members of his own family.

Why do we license boys and girls not old enough to vote, and think their judgment is good enough to be trusted with the most deadly machine in the world—the automobile? Their records as drivers leave a long list of violent deaths and unnecessary permanent injuries, but we still praise them for their quick reaction times, and give them licenses to drive and kill. Parents could keep their children from becoming potential killers, but today's children are too uncontrolled.

Over 25 years ago, because my mother and several other members of my family had been injured in serious automobile traffic accidents, I gave up my private medical practice and became a full-time "life-saving expert." I then began preaching putting governors on cars, and saying daily the life-saving word "slow down and live," "slower driving means a lower death and injury rate," and "death begins at 40."

Today, though it is entirely unreasonable, speed has become the king of the highway, and editors and drivers seem to listen only to the National Safety Council. How the National Safety Council is financed, I do not know; but what it says and does so far has proven to be quite inadequate as far as saving lives and preventing injuries on our highways and streets is concerned.

We now should bring back the old slower and safer driving habit, and put governors on all cars and trucks if we really wish to save lives and prevent the injuries that are daily causing so much despair, misery, and distress in so many American homes. We are brainwashed by comparing one holiday's death toll with another, and led to believe the last year's total was necessary.

Today, I am still advocating that governors be put on all cars, and I still believe that 50 miles an hour is the upper speed limit of safety for all rubber-tired automobiles; and that it is not possible to slow down all driving speeds to 50 without using governors. It is the only quick, safe, and foolproof way of doing that.

Because Americans do not now drive at safer and slower speeds, each year around 40,000 persons lose their lives, and many more than that number are crippled for life. Why don't we who drive slow down to 50 in the country and to 25 in all the settled areas? Where there is no vision the people perish.

ADRIAN H. SCOLTEN, M.D.

PORTLAND, MAINE.

Why the Far East Is Vitally Important

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the Far East is one of our most troublesome and important spots at the present time.

Recently, Mr. Robert R. Gros, vice president of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., of San Francisco, traveled throughout that part of the world and made a report on the new Orient.

Mr. Gros is a very careful and authentic observer, since he has spent much of his mature life in touring the world and making reports on the various countries viewed from the standpoint of a businessman.

I think the following address entitled "Why the Far East Is Vitally Important" delivered to the Commonwealth Club of California on August 16, 1963, is of concern to all of us.

The address follows:

WHY THE FAR EAST IS VITALLY IMPORTANT

In today's world of complexity and perplexity it is increasingly hard to decide which of many crisis ridden spots would be the most productive to visit. Our world is full of fascinating faces and places. It's a problem to choose just where to invest one's vacation most profitably in terms of interesting personal experiences plus substantive opportunities for learning. But most Americans tend to look at the world as a vast aerial photograph, invariably focused most sharply on Europe.

The Far East is there in the picture, to be sure, but generally as a hazy secondary sort of romantic blur. I contend that the time is long since past for us to put on a telephoto lens and zoom in for a closeup on the Far East sector of our fascinating and troubled world. At least four logical reasons occur to me why we should do this.

First, that closeup would make us frighteningly aware that in the Far East they are fighting real wars, not just sending off cold wars. The wars being fought in the jungle paddies of Vietnam and in rough, landlocked Laos are desperately hot. In the Taiwan Straits where the ChiCom and the Nationalists are in direct confrontation the war is always alertly warm at the minimum. Occasionally it's hot, and always it is potentially explosive.

In Singapore and Sarawak it's a cold war, but is showing signs of warming because of the internal communistic heat. There and in Malaya and North Borneo, the components of the soon-to-be-born new nation of Malaysia, we get a good look at heady nationalism.

Third, make no mistake about it, the Orient is coming of age, politically and economically. The Far East holds immense potential for progress or cataprophe. Leading the economic race is vibrant, prosperous Japan which has gone Western with a vengeance. Both Tokyo's tame and dazzling supply of consumer goods leave one dizzy. Western ways in this ancient Eastern land have gone so far in even dress for example that street crowds turn round to gawk at a kimono-clad girl. Tokyo has the bounciest and wildest night life in the world, boasting sort of an ersatz Las Vegas featuring stage-show extravaganzas in varying stages of undress. More basic and more troublesome in the new Japan are the growing pains they are experiencing as they try to adapt to democracy, Japanese style.

Fourth, even from the standpoint of just pleasant tourism the exotic Far East is the place in my book. It's more foreign, if I may use the term, and certainly it eternally fascinates with its bazaar, its sounds, its smells, its color, its scenery, its hard working, philosophic, and kindly people. Apropos tourism, let me unabashedly plug right now about "my new discovery"—new to me that is, although many of you beat me to this pleasure years ago. That is the notion of traveling abroad one way by ship. I have flown nearly a million miles around this world of ours but this time decided for the first time to travel like a gentleman—by

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A5687

[From the Bucyrus (Ohio) Telegraph-Forum,
July 9, 1963]

THREE FORMER PRESIDENTS BACK FREE ENTERPRISE HALL

NEW YORK.—The Hall of Free Enterprise which will dramatize the benefits of the free enterprise system for the 70 million persons expected to visit the New York World's Fair, 1964-65, today won the moral support of the three living former Presidents of the United States.

In a rare endorsement, reaffirming their faith in the free market economy, the three former Chief Executives put their collective stamp of approval on this educational project of the American Economic Foundation.

In separate letters to Charles S. Payson, chairman of the Steering Committee of the Hall of Free Enterprise, Presidents Hoover, Truman and Eisenhower accepted honorary chairmanships of the project's International Advisory Council.

"This action by our three living former Presidents provides great impetus to an educational effort which will reach around the world," said Fred G. Clark, chairman, The American Economic Foundation, sponsor of the Hall of Free Enterprise.

[From the Marion (Ind.) Chronicle, June 9, 1963]

WORLD'S FAIR BUILDING WILL PROMOTE FREE ENTERPRISE

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

Last month ground was broken on the site of next year's New York World's Fair for a unique building frankly designed to sell free enterprise.

It is a new idea—using a building at a major exposition for the purpose of going over to the offensive in the debate with creeping socialism. The estimated \$2.1 million which it will cost to lease the land, erect the building, fill it with exhibits and staff it during the fair's 2-year life is being solicited frankly and openly from individuals and corporations who are sold on the advantage of a free market economy.

The building will stand in rebuttal to the expensive pavilions of socialist nations which can use their taxing power to create monuments to themselves.

Although the American Economic Foundation gave birth to the idea, persons from 40 States and 31 foreign countries will serve on its advisory council.

Among the 70 million persons who are expected to visit the fair during its 2 years it is estimated that 3.5 million will be foreigners. Some of these, it is hoped, will come away from the Hall of Free Enterprise with the realization that "people's capitalism" is different by a long shot from the grasping 19th-century system of exploitation and cartels that Marxists like to pretend all modern free enterprise resembles.

The theme of the exhibit will be the Ten Pillars of Economic Wisdom. Here they are:

1. Nothing in our material world can come from nowhere, nor can it be free. Everything in our economic life has a source, a destination, and a cost that must be paid.
2. Government is never a source of goods. Everything produced is produced by the people, and everything that government gives to the people it must first take from the people.

3. The only valuable money that government has to spend is that money taxed or borrowed out of the people's earnings. When government decides to spend more money than it has thus received, that extra unearned money is created out of thin air, through the banks, and, when spent, takes on value only by reducing the value of all money, savings, and insurance.

4. In our modern exchange economy, all payroll and employment come from customers, and the only worthwhile job security

is customer security. If there are no customers there can be no payroll and no jobs.

5. Customer security can be achieved by the worker only when the "boss" is allowed by the workers to do the things that win and hold customers. Job security, therefore, is a partnership problem that can be solved only by a spirit of understanding and co-operation.

6. Because wages are the principal cost of everything, widespread wage increases, without corresponding increases in production, simply increase the cost of everybody's living.

7. The greatest good for the greatest number means, in its material sense, the greatest goods for the greatest number which, in turn, means the greatest productivity per worker.

8. All productivity is based on three factors: (1) natural resources, whose form, place, and condition are changed by the expenditure of (2) human energy (both muscular and mental), with the aid of (3) tools.

9. Tools are the only one of these three factors that man can increase, and tools come into being in a free society only when there is a reward for the temporary self-denial that people must practice in order to channel part of their earnings away from purchases that produce immediate comfort and pleasure, and into new tools of production. Proper payment for the use of tools is essential to their creation.

10. The productivity of the tools—that is, the efficiency of the human energy applied in connection with their use—is highest in a competitive society in which economic decisions are made by millions of progress-seeking individuals, rather than in a State-planned society in which those decisions are made by a handful of all-powerful people, regardless of how well-meaning, unselfish, sincere and intelligent those people may be.

The basic truth that people cannot divide more than they produce unless they steal or extort from someone else needs to be repeated in this age of pie-in-the-sky government promises.

Further, people need to be reminded that the human animal labors not for love of it but only if enticed by the carrot or goaded by the stick. Where the carrot of profit is removed, then the stick of punishment for failure to produce must be applied or general starvation is swift.

Primitive communism, such as that which prevails in China, has resorted to the stick in the most inhuman degree since the feudal tax gatherers of the Middle Ages went forth to flog the peasants.

More mature forms of communism, such as that of Russia, while continuing to whip recalcitrant workers with the stick of compulsion, have tried to reintroduce the carrot by reserving special bonuses and benefits for the better producers. This is a complete retreat from the Marxist theory of "Form each according to his ability to each according to his need."

But even this halfway return to a system of individual rewards can't overcome the deadening snafu of centralized government planning.

In the face of these manifold failures of the Left it's time the forces of free enterprise stood up and crowed a little.

[From the Quakertown (Pa.) Free Press, July 30, 1963]

PILLARS OF ECONOMIC WISDOM

The great New York World's Fair of 1964-65 is expected to attract some 70 million visitors, with 3.5 million of them coming from foreign lands. And, certainly, one of the most unusual and significant of the exhibitions will be the Hall of Free Enterprise.

Its cost, about \$2.1 million, is being financed by thousands of contributions from individuals and corporations. It is purely noncommercial and education. Its goal is to dramatically demonstrate the simple eco-

nomie facts of life to millions of people who have either had instruction in basic economic principles or are victims of false propaganda.

The foundation is built upon "Ten Pillars of Economic Wisdom." Perhaps the last of these will give a picture of what it stands for: "The productivity of the tools—that is, the efficiency of the human energy applied in connection with their use—is highest in a competitive society in which the economic decisions are made by millions of progress-seeking individuals, rather than in a state-planned society in which those decisions are made by a handful of all-powerful people, regardless of how well-meaning, unselfish, sincere, and intelligent those people may be."

Freedom is the most precious of all possessions. That is the principle this great hall is to stand for.

[From the New York Daily News, June 24, 1963]

MAKE A NOTE OF THIS

The New York World's Fair 1964-65 opens April 22 of next year; and we would like to tip off all who plan to visit the fair on what promises to be one of the most interesting and valuable of all the exhibits.

It is the Hall of Free Enterprise. You will find it on the Avenue of Europe, opposite the Belgian and Vatican City exhibits, and it will be the largest building on International Plaza.

The purpose of the Hall of Free Enterprise will be to show the workings and philosophy of the U.S. profit-and-loss system in pictures and charts and by other visual means.

"The net result of a trip through the Hall of Free Enterprise," say its sponsors, "can be a clearer, better coordinated 'total' conception of economic life than is gained from a 4-year college course. And the 'take home' material provides permanent reinforcement."

The sponsors, incidentally, are a highly responsible group: American Economic Foundation, National Small Business Association, Freedoms Foundation, Junior Achievement, Foundation for Economic Education, Christian Freedom Foundation, Willkie Brothers Foundation, and Canadian Economic Foundation.

Better make a note now to visit the Hall of Free Enterprise, no matter what else you may have to pass up among the fair's numerous exhibits. It sounds like a must, with a capital M.

The CIA Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill H.J. Res. 211, that would establish a Joint Congressional Committee to serve as a "watchdog" over the activities of the CIA. Several Members of the House and Senate have offered similar legislation in regard to the need of this "watchdog" committee. I am inserting in the RECORD at this point a copy of the September 10, 1963, editorial from the Washington Post, that draws attention also to the need of new measures to be taken in regard to coordinating the efforts of the CIA:

THE CIA AGAIN

The United States has been understandably embarrassed by the disclosure that the CIA has been secretly aiding the South Viet-

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

7733

ing, barefooted children, the sick and dying huddled in doorways, invariably show unconcerned Nazi soldiers looking on, or snapping pictures of misery as though it were a tourist attraction.

The exhibit is expertly laid out in symbolic pattern, beginning on the ground floor with portraits of magnificently bearded Jewish scholars of the prewar years, when Warsaw was 30.1 percent Jewish.

The winding gallery then traces the fall of Warsaw, September 29, 1939, the German occupation, and the herding into the ghetto whose walls were sealed shut November 15, 1940. Here, on a simulated brick wall is inscribed "Halt."

The progressive pauperization of the Jews and the staggering tabulations of death from hunger and disease are relieved by brave scenes of schools, self-help projects, raising potatoes in God knows what plot of earth, and the indomitable cultural programs of music, drama, and religious observances that is the marvel of the ghetto story.

Here, the exhibit moves upstairs to scenes of the uprising.

The exhibit ends with a vast panorama of rubble, a picture of the flattened synagogue and memorial photos of the heroic Jewish fighters, both men and women, whose faces show expressions not seen in any other exhibits. In contrast, the Nazis' faces no longer look jaunty, but haggard.

[From the New York Sunday Mirror]

WARSAW GHETTO EXHIBIT

(By Charles A. Wagner)

You enter the old Vanderbilt mansion on Fifth Avenue and suddenly history plays you a strange trick and you are in the Warsaw ghetto where the Nazis are decimating the Jewish population behind the wall of fate. That's transformation for you.

In this exhibit, the city's most stirring and most meaningful, mazes of rare photos, documents, captured movie film, and a portrait gallery of the real heroes of the uprising spring to life again. For they dared to fight back.

Gathered from Poland, Israel, and other countries, the displays at the YIVO Institute for Jewish Research dramatize some of the darkest chapters in the annals of modern man (1048 Fifth Avenue through May).

[From the New York World Telegram]

EXHIBIT MARKS REVOLT IN WARSAW GHETTO

An exhibit which depicts the persecution of the Jews of Warsaw during World War II will go on view Sunday at the headquarters of the YIVO Institute for Jewish Research in conjunction with the 20th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising.

The exhibit, which includes pictures, documents, and maps, shows Jewish life in Warsaw before the Nazi persecution began and traces the steps which led to extermination of the city's Jews in 1943. YIVO headquarters is at Fifth Avenue and East 86th Street.

Other events commemorating the ghetto uprising include:

A meeting and memorial service at 1 p.m. Sunday at Manhattan Center. Featured speakers will be Edward Drozniak, Polish Ambassador to the United States, and retired Brig. Gen. Hugh B. Hester.

A memorial meeting at 8:30 p.m. Sunday at Bronx House, 990 Pelham Parkway, Bronx. Joseph Kutrzeba, who fought in the ghetto uprising, and later volunteered for service with the U.S. Army in the Korean fighting, will be the principal speaker.

A commemorative meeting at 8:15 p.m. Monday at the Community Center, 270 West 89th Street. Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, New York, and Haim Zohar, Israeli consul, will be the featured speakers.

A joint commemorative meeting sponsored by 30 national and local Jewish organizations

will be held at 1:30 p.m. Sunday at Carnegie Hall. Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, New York, heads the list of speakers, and a dramatic presentation depicting the sacrifices of the ghetto fighters is planned.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS
FAVOR VETERANS' COMMITTEE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, for years I have urged the creation of a Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the Senate. Earlier this week, I had the privilege of talking with the national commanders of the major veterans' organizations of this country who are beginning to question whether the Senate has forgotten about the creation of such a committee.

Veterans' affairs are today so far-reaching in scope and volume that they urgently require a standing committee with special competence. The heavy burdens of the Finance Committee and of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee no longer leave sufficient time for Senators or staff members to consider legislation affecting veterans in depth.

To postpone consideration of a Veterans' Committee until congressional reform and reorganization is studied would be ill-advised and frustrate a need recognized by a large number of this body. I have previously placed in the RECORD earlier today a number of resolutions approving of the establishment of a Senate Veterans' Committee.

NEBRASKA LEADS NATION IN DURABLE GOODS GROWTH RATE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, while agriculture remains the basic industry of Nebraska, we have long recognized the need for an increased diversification into various fields of manufacture.

Marked success has been made in this effort, principally in the processing of agricultural products.

It is particularly gratifying to note that a recent economic study reveals that Nebraska now leads the Nation in its rate of growth in the production of durable goods.

While our total production in this category is relatively modest, it is encouraging to observe that since the 1957 to 1959 period our State has led all others in terms of growth in hard-goods production.

This fact is a tribute to the many forward-looking citizens and business leaders of Nebraska who have been working to bring industry to the State.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Omaha World-Herald which describes this growth.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEBRASKA'S HARD-GOODS GROWTH RATE LEADS
UNITED STATES

(By Nathan Nielsen)

Nebraska stands first in the Nation in the rate of growth of durable goods production, according to a New York investment counseling and economic consulting firm.

Lionel D. Edie & Co., which conducts studies of economic conditions and trends, charted growth rates by States since 1957-

59 and found Nebraska in the lead in the durable goods category.

In total manufacturing growth since 1957-50, the Edie & Co., copyrighted report said Nebraska is now the eighth growth state.

The report referred strictly to growth—not comparisons by States in manufacturing volume. In volume, according to Census Bureau reports, Nebraska stands far down the list.

Durable goods produced in Nebraska, according to Edie & Co., are primary metals and nonelectrical machinery.

Other items classified as durable goods but which the company doesn't list for Nebraska are ordnance and accessories, lumber and wood products, furniture, and fixtures stone, clay and glass products, fabricated metal, electrical machinery, transportation equipment, instruments, sporting goods, and jewelry.

The Edie & Co., determination of growth rates is based on the company's own statistical work, said George F. Frey, senior account executive.

"For the last several years we have been in the process of developing a major breakthrough in the uses of indexes of production for each of the continental 48 States," he said.

"The significance of our work is that it enables us to measure economic activity on a State-by-State basis, thus providing a comparison of relative economic growth rates," Mr. Frey said.

The growth rate comparisons appeared in an Edie & Co. banking bulletin which commented:

"It is apparent that many banks are witnessing an outstandingly superior rate of growth in their commercial loans. To the extent that they are in superior growth States, their loan demand should be superior."

John F. Davis, president of the First National Bank of Omaha, said the Edie & Co. report helps explain some of the unusually strong demand the Omaha banks have had for loans the last 2 years.

Edie & Co., supplies speakers for the First National Bank's annual forum of finance.

The latest survey of manufacturing, published by the U.S. Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census in January, covered 1961. The survey showed that, in Nebraska: Total employees in manufacturing in 1961 were 62,074, compared with 58,625 in 1958.

The total payroll for manufacturing employees grew to \$319,520,000 in 1961 from \$289,198,000 in 1959.

The value added to products through manufacturing—derived by subtracting costs from the value of finished products—rose to \$658,838,000 in 1961 from \$569,924,000 in 1959.

CIA ACTIVITY IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article by Arthur Krock in the New York Times of today, October 3, 1963. It discusses a report which is highly critical of the CIA and its activity in South Vietnam. This report, to which Mr. Krock refers, likens the CIA to a malignancy and states that twice that Agency has flatly refused to carry out instructions from Ambassador Lodge.

As one who has followed the work of the CIA since its inception and closely since the time Allan Dulles and now John McCone have been its Directors, I can testify as to its responsibility, its intelligent activity and loyalty to our Chief Executives and their administrations.

Of course the Agency has made mistakes, but it has never been disloyal to

17734

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

October 3

its boss and it is not now in carrying out its activities in South Vietnam. Any report to the contrary will be proved to be without foundation. Of that I am confident.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INTRA-ADMINISTRATION WAR IN VIETNAM
(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, October 2.—The Central Intelligence Agency is getting a very bad press in dispatches from Vietnam to American newspapers and in articles originating in Washington. Like the Supreme Court when under fire, the CIA cannot defend itself in public retorts to criticisms of its activities as they occur. But, unlike the Supreme Court, the CIA has no open record of its activities on which the public can base a judgment of the validity of the criticisms. Also, the Agency is precluded from using the indirect defensive tactic which is constantly employed by all other Government units under critical fire.

This tactic is to give information to the press, under a seal of confidence, that challenges or refutes the critics. But the CIA cannot father such inspired articles, because to do so would require some disclosure of its activities. And not only does the effectiveness of the Agency depend on the secrecy of its operations. Every President since the CIA was created has protected this secrecy from claimants—Congress or the public through the press, for example—of the right to share any part of it.

WITH HIGH FREQUENCY

This Presidential policy has not, however, always restrained other executive units from going confidentially to the press with attacks on CIA operations in their common field of responsibility. And usually it has been possible to deduce these operational details from the nature of the attacks. But the peak of the practice has recently been reached in Vietnam and in Washington. This is revealed almost every day now in dispatches from reporters—in close touch with intra-administration critics of the CIA—with excellent reputations for reliability.

One reporter in this category is Richard Starnes of the Scripps-Howard newspapers. Today, under a Saigon dateline, he related that, "according to a high U.S. source here, twice the CIA flatly refused to carry out instructions from Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge * * * [and] in one instance frustrated a plan of action Mr. Lodge brought from Washington because the agency disagreed with it." Among the views attributed to U.S. officials on the scene, including one described as a "very high American official * * * who has spent much of his life in the service of democracy * * * are the following:

The CIA's growth was "likened to a malignancy" which the "very high official was not sure even the White House could control * * * any longer." "If the United States ever experiences—an attempt at a coup to overthrow the Government—it will come from the CIA and not the Pentagon." The agency "represents a tremendous power and total unaccountability to anyone."

DISORDERLY GOVERNMENT

Whatever else these passages disclose, they most certainly establish that representatives of other executive branches have expanded their war against the CIA from the inner government councils to the American people via the press. And published simultaneously are details of the Agency's operations in Vietnam that can come only from the same critical official sources. This is disorderly government. And the longer the President tolerates it—the period already is considerable—the greater will grow its potentials of

hampering the real war against the Vietcong and the impression of a very indecisive administration in Washington.

The CIA may be guilty as charged. Since it cannot, or at any rate will not, openly defend its record in Vietnam, or defend it by the same confidential press briefings employed by its critics, the public is not in a position to judge. Nor is this Department, which sought and failed to get even the outlines of the Agency's case in rebuttal. But Mr. Kennedy will have to make a judgment if the spectacle of war within the executive branch is to be ended and the effective functioning of the CIA preserved. And when he makes this judgment, hopefully, he also will make it public, as well as the appraisal of fault on which it is based.

Doubtless recommendations as to what his judgment should be were made to him today by Secretary of Defense McNamara and General Taylor on their return from their fact-finding expedition into the embattled official jungle in Saigon.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. PROXMIER obtained the floor.

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] for 4 minutes without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

COSTS OF SENATE STAFFING

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, Mr. Felton West, chief of the Washington bureau of the Houston Post, is one of the most astute and determined newsmen covering the Nation's capital.

The Monday, September 22, edition of the Post carried an article about the costs of Senate staffing which attests to Mr. West's skill. Since this so-called hush-hush matter is of considerable consequence to Senators, I commend Mr. West's article to the attention of my colleagues and the general public, and ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATORS' STAFF PAY HUSH-HUSH

(By Felton West)

WASHINGTON—One of the most hush-hush subjects on Capitol Hill, it was found last week, is that of how much U.S. Senators can spend to hire their office staffs.

A taxpayer might think he is thoroughly entitled to a frank disclosure and discussion of this from the Senate employees who disburse the money and keep the books. If not from them, at least from any Senator.

After all, it is public money and there is no security question involved—except possibly the security of the Senators and their rather exclusive club.

It would be a cold day in the boiler room when a Senator could not find out how much an executive department agency was allowed to spend for salaries unless national security was involved. The House of Representatives Disbursing Office speaks frankly about the limits on spending for House Members' staffs.

But finding out what limits there are on the Senators' payrolls becomes a major task.

A query about this to the Office of the Secretary of the Senate, which publishes quarterly reports showing how much each Sen-

ator actually pays his office employees during each quarter, was referred to the Senate Disbursing Office.

Robert A. Brenkworth, the \$18,880-a-year financial clerk in charge of such funds in the Senate Disbursing Office, refused to say what the limits are.

Perhaps, he suggested, the Texas Senators would tell.

Brenkworth said the limits are spelled out in the law in title 2 of the United States Code. But he declined to explain the law and discouraged the reporter even from sitting down in his office and studying it.

"I think you would be a lot more comfortable up in the law library," said Brenkworth, putting his law book away.

The reporter found the law, in the library, quite confusing, in the absence of any explanation from anybody who understood the payroll system.

He failed to find anybody on the staff of the Senate Rules and Administration Committee, which has jurisdiction over the Senate contingent fund, from which office payroll salaries come, who would discuss the payroll limits. Ditto for the Senate Appropriations Committee, where a staff member said the committee has nothing to do with the limits (although the committee is in charge of appropriations for the contingent fund).

So then, Senators RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Democrat of Texas, and JOHN G. TOWER, Republican of Texas.

Senator YARBOROUGH said each Senator has a specific lump sum for staff and purchase of equipment (typewriters, copy machines, etc.) for his office. There is a complicated formula of limits, based on the population of States and thus varying, he said.

For big States like Texas, this allowance is not adequate, he said.

"What is allowed for States like Texas and California is plain murder," he said. "They take a terrible clobbering."

But what the limits are for Senators of the various States—even his own limit—YARBOROUGH refused to reveal.

Asked why they should not be public knowledge, he said, "I don't object to your finding out, but this is the business of the Rules Committee and I'm not going to tell you what isn't my business and have a bunch of Senators jumping on me. I'm not going to meddle in the Rules Committee's business."

When told that the information could not be obtained at the Rules Committee or the disbursing office, YARBOROUGH said he did not know the limits for the other States, anyway.

"I could go over and find out," he said. "But I've got 10 million people to represent and I don't have time to go meddling in things like that."

He called efforts by newspapers to check into Senators' staff expenditures "nit picking" that was bad for the morale and efficiency of Senate employees.

"I refuse to help downgrade the efficiency of the Senate," he said, as further explanation of his refusal to reveal the limits.

YARBOROUGH said the greatest weakness of the Senate is failure to hire enough staff. This is true of Senate committees even more than of individual Senators' offices, he said.

"The legislative branch is constantly losing power to the executive branch," he said. "The executive is voted a budget of \$100 billion a year and Congress is not even voted enough money to hire people to answer mail."

Senator TOWER said he would not violate Senate "practice" by discussing the spending limits for Senators in general.

"It would seem to me that the limits should be public knowledge," he granted, "and it would be all right with me if they were all made public. I don't mind telling you mine."

Then he checked up quickly and revealed that there is a base limit of \$67,980 for